



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-214
Monday
5 November 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-214

CONTENTS

5 November 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Warsaw Pact Members Reach Arms Accord [TASS]	1
Paper Urges U.S. Action on Nonproliferation [IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]	1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Primakov Interviewed on Talks With Saddam Husayn [Moscow TV]	3
Paper Reports on Falin 31 Oct News Conference [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]	3
Analyst Hopes for 'Truly Historic' CSCE Summit [TASS]	4
International Observers Roundtable Presented 4 Nov [Moscow Radio]	4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Baker To Meet in Moscow 8 Nov [TASS]	9
Petrovskiy Meets With Visiting USIA Director [Moscow TV]	9
U.S. Defense Cuts Called Not 'Substantive' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]	9
Talks With U.S. on Chemical Weapons Ban Viewed [TASS]	10

China

PRC Envoy, Falin Discuss Popov's Taiwan Trip [TASS]	11
'Some Progress' Made in Sino-Soviet Border Talks [Moscow International]	11
Yazov Receives PRC Military Writers Delegation [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]	11

Northeast Asia

Debate With Japan Over Kurils Continues [PRAVDA 1 Nov]	11
Soviets Promise To Repay Debt to Japan [Tokyo KYODO]	13
Direct Telephone Links With ROK To Open [TASS]	13
Mediating Role, Tension Reduction in Koreas Eyed [Moscow International]	14
Economic Agreement with DPRK Signed [TASS]	15
U.S. Troop Withdrawal Reportedly Worries ROK [Moscow International]	15

Near East & South Asia

Bogomolov: 'Symbolic' Military Gulf Role Possible [Hamburg DPA]	15
Primakov Reviews Efforts To Resolve Gulf Crisis [Cairo AL-AHALI 31 Oct]	15
'Military Specialists' Return From Iraq 2 Nov [Moscow International]	16
Soviet Military Experts in Iraq Interviewed [IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]	16
Commentator Reviews Iraqi Options in Gulf Crisis [Radio Peace and Progress]	19
Solton Comments on Baker's Gulf Tour Goals [Moscow International]	20

Sub-Saharan Africa

Prospect for South African Reform Examined [Moscow International]	20
South Africans Arrested for Smuggling [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct]	21
Release Sought for Soviets Held in Ethiopia [IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]	21

West Europe

Bogomolov on Support From Bonn, Troop Withdrawal [Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG 4 Nov]	22
Moscow Enumerates Military Defections to FRG [Moscow Radio]	23
Documents Released on Prewar German Cooperation [TASS]	23
Scandinavians Cited on Soviet Immigration Fears [IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]	23
PRAVDA on Gorbachev Paris News Conference [31 Oct]	24

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Presidium Considers Upcoming People's Congress [TASS]	32
Supreme Soviet Resolution on Winter Preparations [IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]	32

Political & Social

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Moldavia [Moscow TV]	33
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Address Students [PRAVDA 3 Nov]	34
Federation Council Discusses Union Treaty [TASS]	42
Presidential Council Personnel Changes Reported [Moscow Radio]	43
Moscow Approves National Day Parallel Rallies [TASS]	43
Council for International Fronts Established [TASS]	43
Government Urges Observance for Union Laws [TASS]	43
Interethnic Front Denounces Gorbachev [TASS]	44
CPSU's Financial 'Complications' Revealed [PRAVDA 3 Nov]	44
Domestic Instability Imperils Foreign Credit [IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]	45
UN Should Mediate USSR Interethnic Disputes [PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK No 42]	47
Writers Weekly Independence Move Criticized [PRAVDA 22 Oct]	49
TRUD Supplement Trial Issue Published [TRUD 25 Oct]	52
Poll Shows Less Support for CPSU, Army [NEW TIMES No 43]	52
Kalugin Case Against Ryzhkov To Proceed [TASS]	53
Yeltsin Message Featured in New Newspaper [Moscow Radio]	53
Aktubinsk Student Murder Trial Opens [PRAVDA 1 Nov]	53
Yakovlev on Value of Studying History [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Oct]	54

Economic

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Foreign Currency Fund [TASS]	55
National Income Expected To Fall 4-5 Percent [Moscow TV]	56
Shatalin, Others Send 'Message' on 500 Days Plan [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Nov] ..	56
Conference Held To Establish Moscow Stock Market [PRAVDA 2 Nov]	58
'Industrial Smuggling' Trial Ends With Acquittal [Moscow International]	58
Aviation Business Center Set Up in Moscow [Moscow TV]	58
Ministry Bureaucracy Blocks Cambodian Trade Deal [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Oct]	58
Trade Union Congress Forms General Confederation [TRUD 27 Oct]	59
Further on Trade Union Decisions [TRUD 28 Oct]	60
Stroyev Addresses Peasant, Collective Farm Groups [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Oct]	61

Agricultural

End-October Weather, Crop Status Report [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Nov]	62
Harvest Conclusion, Sowing Shortfall Detailed [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 3 Nov]	63
Agricultural Highlights for 28 Oct-3 Nov Reviewed [Moscow Radio]	64

Scientific

Communications Satellite Launched 3 Nov [TASS]	64
Cosmonauts Begin Fourth Month in Space [TASS]	64

Soviet-Canadian Meeting on Space Biology Ends	[TASS]	64
Charity Project Urges SRV-USSR Cooperation	[PRAVDA 27 Oct]	65
Scientist Urges Cooperation To Save Black Sea	[TASS]	65

Military

Procedure for Moscow Military Parade Outlined	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Nov]	65
Protesters Disrupt Tanks' Parade Practice	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]	66
CPSU Commission on Military Policy Meets	[PRAVDA 31 Oct]	67
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Session	[1 Nov]	68
North Caucasus Allays Anxieties About Draft	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]	68
Shchit Official Defends Coup Charges	[SOBESEDNİK No 40]	69
Solovyev Views Soviet Army Criticism	[Moscow International]	71

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Prunskiene Discusses Problems Facing Lithuania	[Vilnius International]	72
Bickauskas Considers Negotiations 'Broken Off'	[Vilnius Radio]	73
Vilnius Garrison Prepares for 7 Nov Parade	[Vilnius Radio]	73
Gorbunovs Receives Invitation From Gorbachev	[Riga Radio]	74
Attacks Against Latvian Servicemen Reported	[Moscow Radio]	74
Training of Iraqi Technicians in Latvia Cut Short	[Vilnius International]	74
Baltic Significance to Soviet Military Analyzed	[BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA 18 Sep]	74
Latvian People's Front Holds Party Congress	[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Oct]	75
Pre-November 7 Rally Held in Estonia	[Moscow TV]	77
Rally Turns Anti-Soviet	[Tallinn Radio]	77
Tallinn Garrison Chief Announces 7 Nov Parade	[Moscow Radio]	77
Estonian Party Protests Property Nationalization	[PRAVDA 31 Oct]	78

RSFSR

Yeltsin 'Officially Reported' To Resume Work	[TASS]	78
Predicts USSR Resignation Demand	[TASS]	78
Khasbulatov Comments on Supreme Soviet Session	[TASS]	78
Silayev Interviewed on 500 Days Program Aspects		79
On Market Economy	[Moscow Radio]	79
On Economic Reform	[Moscow TV]	81
RSFSR 9-Month Economic Performance Analyzed	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]	83
Silayev Holds 'Consultations' With Army Officers	[Moscow International]	85
RSFSR Signs Trade Agreement With Malta	[TASS]	85
Gidasov Cited on Leningrad 7 Nov Parade	[Moscow TV]	86
Leningraders Polled on Parade	[Moscow Radio]	86
RENMIN RIBAO Delegation Visits Leningrad	[PRAVDA 31 Oct]	87

Western Republics

Crisis Situation in Gagauz Republic Continues		87
Gorbachev Interviewed on Situation	[Moscow TV]	87
State of Emergency Declared	[TASS]	88
'Alarming' Reports from Moldavia	[TASS]	88
Tensions Reach 'New Highs'	[TASS]	88
Situation Remains Tense	[TASS]	88
Kostash Denies Militia Used Weapons	[TASS]	89
Deputy Demands Druk's Resignation	[Moscow Radio]	89
Shatalin Discusses Troops' Use	[Moscow TV]	89
Moldavian Legislature Views Unrest	[TASS]	90
Gorbachev Meets With Snegur	[PRAVDA 4 Nov]	91
Snegur Briefs Legislature on Talks	[TASS]	91
Deputies Demand Bakatin's Resignation	[TASS]	92

'Tragic Events' Examined [TASS]	92
MVD Deputy Minister Comments [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 4 Nov]	92
Leader Views Current Issues [Moscow Radio]	94
Yeltsin Sends Legislators to Area [TASS]	94
Further Report on Situation [Moscow TV]	94
Stabilization Measures Adopted [TASS]	95
Militia Accused of Random Shooting [Moscow TV]	95
Army Role Deemed 'Constructive' [Moscow TV]	96
Conciliation Commission Visits Tiraspol [TASS]	96
'Coupon' Distribution for Goods in Ukraine [TRUD]	96
Ukraine Adopts Plan for Economic Independence [TASS]	97
Ukraine Opposition To Hamper 7 Nov Celebrations [Moscow Radio]	97
Workers Support Celebrations [TASS]	97
Ukrainian Orthodox Patriarch Visits Kiev [IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]	98
Shirkovskiy Confirmed as Belorussian KGB Chief [Moscow Radio]	99

Caucasus

Nagorno-Karabakh Commander Cancels 7 Nov Parade [TASS]	99
Ter-Petrosyan Discusses Armenian-Turkish Ties [GOLOS ARMENII 7 Oct]	99
Extended Armenia Rationing Details Cited [Moscow TV]	100
Armenian Science Academy Freed From Party Control [ARMENPRESS]	100
Further Georgian Elections Results Reported [TASS]	100
Georgian News Agency Changes Name, Status [Moscow Radio]	101

Central Asia

Government Structure Reorganized in Uzbekistan [TASS]	101
New Kirghiz President Akayev Interviewed [KOMсомOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Oct]	101
Kirghizia, Belorussia Sign Cooperation Accord [TASS]	102
New Turkmen President Niyazov Sworn in 2 Nov [Moscow TV]	102
Priorities Outlined [IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]	103

Warsaw Pact Members Reach Arms Accord

LD0311195490 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT
3 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest November 3 TASS—The agreement on maximum levels of conventional armaments and hardware for Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in connection with the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe was signed here today.

An important step was made on the way to signing the treaty on conventional armaments, the preparation of which is now coming to an end in Vienna. The maximum levels of each type of armament for each country have been set. The Warsaw Treaty member states managed to settle this important package of problems within the framework of their consultation mechanisms, thus making a substantial contribution to the working out of the future treaty.

Paper Urges U.S. Action on Nonproliferation

PM0211115190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Union Edition p 5

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Vikentiy Matveyev:
"Is the Nuclear Club Expanding?"]

[Text] Some Western observers believe that the main reason for the buildup of U.S. forces against Iraq is Washington's concern over the possibility of Baghdad getting nuclear weapons. These observers reckon that preventing this by any means is equally as important a task as restoring Kuwaiti sovereignty.

But it is not only a matter of Iraq. Voicing the position of influential Washington circles, some time ago Senator John Glenn pointed to the "increase in the threat of nuclear war, not because of what the Soviet Union is doing but because small or less industrially developed countries may get hold of nuclear weapons."

A U.S. journal published information based on CIA data 11 July 1988 regarding the number of nuclear charges possessed by four countries. It was claimed then that Israel has at least 100 units, the RSA [Republic of South Africa]—approximately 20, India—the same, and Pakistan—four. The journal wrote the following: "Technically a nuclear war between Third World countries has become an alarming possibility...."

The U.S. Congress reacted resolutely this fall to a report of an attempt by Pakistan to obtain from a U.S. company the high-temperature furnaces needed to produce atomic bombs. Islamabad was told that U.S. economic and military aid would cease. People on Capitol Hill took this step despite the fact that Pakistan has sent several thousand of its troops to reinforce U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia.

Washington's political and military circles do not hide their concern that the two largest countries in Latin America—Argentina and Brazil—may become nuclear powers.

The gravity of the problem is obvious on a global scale. It is all the more irritating that a real chance of making common efforts to resolve it was lost at the fourth Geneva conference 20 August through 15 September examining the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Article 6 of the treaty requires that all signatories take effective steps to put a stop to the nuclear arms race and implement disarmament in this sphere. A pledge which, understandably, applies primarily to those countries that possess nuclear weapons.

What happened at the Geneva conference? Delegations from virtually all countries advocated bolstering the nuclear nonproliferation regime and to this end called for the complete cessation of testing as a step which should create the requisite material conditions to ensure that mass-destruction weapons do not spread around our planet.

Is that logical? Quite. However, it did not prove possible to secure the sought-after accord in Geneva. The conference did not even adopt a final document although it did nonetheless manage to make some progress on certain issues. Such important suppliers of nuclear fuel for nuclear power stations as Germany and Japan agreed that all enterprises everywhere that procure these materials should in the future be embraced by strict IAEA—International Atomic Energy Agency—guarantees. New ideas to improve the IAEA inspection mechanism were put forward.

But the Geneva conference failed on the main issue. The U.S. and British delegations refused to come to an accommodation with the other delegations on the question of the complete cessation of nuclear testing.

The security of all states—without exception—will not be reinforced but undermined if mass-destruction weapons spread around the globe like a malignant tumor. Britain's influential FINANCIAL TIMES stated with full justification in its 12 October editorial: "Nuclear proliferation represents a real threat to NATO countries' security."

And not only to them of course. As is well known, the USSR Supreme Soviet recently deemed it necessary to once again draw the attention of the world's legislatures and public to the urgent need for the most speedy cessation of all nuclear testing as one of the most implement elements for strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and eliminating weapons. Our country is ready to turn the year-long break in Soviet nuclear testing into an indefinite, definitive break if the U.S. Government also stops its programs for tests of this kind unilaterally or on the basis of a mutual accord.

Our legislators are saying that they are prepared for the USSR to become a nuclear-free state altogether. If talks

can be held on the complete banning of chemical weapons, why is the same not possible for the equally dreadful nuclear weapons?

Soviet legislators are waiting for their colleagues in other countries to respond to this appeal. The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation gave this appeal to the U.S. Congress. On his return to Moscow delegation head G. Borovik noted the positive mood in the Congress at least with regard to substantially reducing the level of nuclear tests without delay. However, this is the very minimum that should be done.

U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker had every reason to say that the problem of nuclear proliferation is the main threat to security in the nineties. Our country and the United States can do a great deal to remove this threat through cooperation.

It is necessary to act, and the complete cessation of nuclear tests could be an important step in protecting mankind from the uncontrolled anarchy of nuclear arms. The nuclear test on Novaya Zemlya has once again shown the world public that it is impossible to unilaterally stop explosions of this kind. Joint steps are required, but the main thing is for all parties to want this.

A desire based on correct, realistic understanding of what the prevailing world situation requires of states which possess nuclear weapons but which do not see this as some kind of special privilege but rather as a duty to mankind—to protect the world from the disaster of a devastating conflict. This threat will increase if the nuclear club expands. Since people in Washington understand the danger of nuclear proliferation, they should draw practical conclusions to avert this process. Today. Tomorrow may be too late.

Primakov Interviewed on Talks With Saddam Husayn
LD0311185390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1545 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Interview with Presidential Council member Ye.M. Primakov by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; from the "International Panorama" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] What is the potential for common sense—if one can put it like that—among the opposing sides? Is it great, or is the opposite true?

[Primakov] Generally speaking, I understand that the issue is very complex, because on the one hand it is necessary, without a doubt, to make Iraq leave Kuwait. The whole world community should attempt to achieve this and in such a way that Iraq leaves unrewarded for what it has done. A very delicate boundary exists which is possibly difficult to even determine—between rewarding Iraq on the one hand, and on the other granting it the opportunity to save face when it leaves. Then it also has its own problems, after all, which it would like to resolve. At the same time, the concern of those who live in the vicinity of Iraq is understandable, as is their striving to obtain a certain guarantee for the future so that what has happened in Kuwait would not be repeated.

Concern also exists within Iraq itself. For example, I said frankly to Saddam Husayn: Did he not have some kind of [word indistinct] complex, like the Israelis, to the effect that they are surrounded on all sides; that it was necessary, lowering one's head, to leave these surroundings; that it would be better to die than to surrender; and so on. They are thus faced with the question either to capitulate or to die. They are faced with the question either to return and live in a normal, civilized society, subordinating themselves to the laws of this civilization and demanding the protection of their own interests, unconditionally, or to have a common—some kind of action—that could occur in extreme form.

Paper Reports on Falin 31 Oct News Conference
PM0211145590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Colonel V. Markushin report: "Meeting with Journalists"]

[Text] At least 200 Soviet and foreign journalists came to the CPSU Central Committee Press Center on the last day of October to receive information "from the hands" of Valentin Falin, spokesman for this organ, on the position of the country's largest party on the most urgent international problems.

First of all, on the situation in the Persian Gulf zone. This is the most acute problem today, which fact was

reflected in the substance of the CPSU Central Committee secretary's meeting with an audience of journalists. What will happen there now? War or a still more intensive search for a political solution?

Setting forth the party's position on this question, V. Falin pointed out that the world community would be acting precipitately if it were to consider now that peaceful means of surmounting the conflict in the Persian Gulf region have been exhausted. This is far from being so. The sanctions announced by the United Nations against Iraq have hardly functioned yet and, to judge from incoming information, are being violated and are not yet having the necessary effect. The Arab factor has not yet been made apparent. It is difficult, if it is possible at all, to find a long-term solution without the participation of the Arabs and without regard for their interests.

The party leader rejected the claims by certain foreign mass media that Ye. Primakov's mission proved unsuccessful. The trip by the USSR president's special representative made it possible to gather important material for thought. We now know more about the motives of the Iraqi leadership. And Iraq has been convinced of the firmness of the Soviet Union's principled position.

I would like to single out that part of the discussion which touched on Soviet-German relations. The significance of these relations, as V. Falin remarked, is determined by the great weight of both countries in European and world affairs. This is evidenced not only by 20th-century experience but also by earlier experience. And it has to be supposed that 21st-century experience will also attest to this. The visible future of Germany is its development as a unified state. The difficulties on this plane are obvious. Unification is the start, not the end of this process. The integration of the two economies will take time and material expenditure of an order greater than it seemed quite recently.

Concerning Soviet-Chinese relations, V. Falin emphasized the special significance of a careful attitude by both countries to the fruit of the joint efforts for rapprochement. The CPSU and the CPC have special assessments of urgent problems. But similarity is to be observed in many respects. This is a solid base for a further dialogue in a calm, comradely key.

Replying to a Japanese correspondent's question as to whether the Soviet Union really intends to hand over to Japan two islands in the Kuril chain, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said that this is not so. Voicing his opinion of this question, he pointed out that Soviet-Japanese relations will develop the more successfully, the fewer prior conditions are laid down. Good-neighborliness must not be built on haggling.

Another important point, in my view, was the building of the common European home and the possibility of the

coexistence of ideologies. In V. Falin's opinion, ideologies can "cohabit." The principle of pluralism presupposes precisely this—tolerance toward different opinions and different assessments.

Analyst Hopes for 'Truly Historic' CSCE Summit

*LD0311132690 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT
3 Nov 90*

[By TASS News Analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow November 3 TASS—The two-day meeting of Europe's neutral and non-aligned states at the foreign minister level ended in Helsinki on Friday. The conference was devoted to preparations for the Paris summit of the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which is scheduled for November 19-21.

Judging by the final communique adopted by the ministers, the neutral and non-aligned states in Europe are fully determined to make their constructive contribution to building a new Europe.

The meeting in Helsinki is a component of the vast preparatory work which has reached a culminating point at the special meeting in New York in early October. At that meeting, the foreign ministers of all CSCE member-countries and also Albania, which decided to join the Helsinki process, discussed the holding of the Paris summit.

They chose the venue and the date for the holding of the "Helsinki-2" forum, formulated the agenda and mapped out the tasks and goals of the forum.

Peoples are awaiting a lot from the summit. They hope for its success as it will concentrate on how we will live together and cooperate in a totally new era.

The Paris summit is meant officially to bury the cold war, forge accord through creating CSCE structures, including a permanent secretariat, lay the foundation for new disarmament talks and adopt a declaration of intent.

Now that slightly more than two weeks are left before the Paris summit, the consensus on security, the key issue, has already been shaped. The outlines of the modern European security system structure formed within the CSCE framework came into focus.

The idea for creating a CSCE centre for the prevention of conflict won general approval. The centre will engage both in military and political aspects of security.

An Assembly of Europe, a CSCE parliament, is planned to be formed. A mechanism of regular political meetings and consultations at various political levels, including at the top level, is being elaborated.

Decisions on this score will lay the groundwork for the future common European home and will make the disarmament process irreversible. But the building of

this house, to which French President Francois Mitterrand gave the name of an European confederation, will not go ahead without another major foundation—asserting democracies, based on a market economy and the mechanism of social justice, throughout the continent.

A proposal was made to adopt at the Paris summit a charter of the United Nations of Europe—a legal document defining the rights and obligations of states, containing elements of judicial influence and, if need be, compulsion with the help of multi-national forces.

The view is also expressed to turn the planned declaration on relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries into a pact of friendship based on principles of security as well as close political, economic and cultural cooperation.

In short, there are all grounds to hope that the Paris summit will become a truly historic meeting, switching Europe from the East-West confrontation to accord and interaction, which are so sorely needed for the future Europe to become united, peace and democratic.

International Observers Roundtable Presented 4 Nov

*LD0411192290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1230 GMT 4 Nov 90*

["International Observers at the Round Table" program, hosted by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, Gosteleradio political observer, with Galina Eduardovna Sidorova, NOVOYE VREMYA political observer; and Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Tolpygin, ZA RUBEZHOM deputy editor in chief]

[Excerpts] [Zholkver] Good day, esteemed listeners. Not for nothing do people say that things are best viewed from a distance. A week has already passed since our president visited Spain and France. In our tempestuous and eventful times, a week is a long time. But the world press, above all newspapers in Europe, continue to comment extensively on these visits. However, rather than dwell on these commentaries, I think we should answer questions which often crop up in letters from our listeners. They ask whether now is an appropriate time to be visiting foreign countries, in view of the difficult situation in our country. They even go so far as to ask what we stand to gain from these visits. Galina Eduardovna, as someone who has worked as a special correspondent covering many of these visits, as a woman and, no doubt, as a housewife, I am giving you the first opportunity to answer this question.

[Sidorova] Thank you. That being the case, I would like to say straightaway that we are indeed giving a great deal of attention to the economic and financial side of the matter, including the profitability of our policies. But I get the impression that we are too much carried away by these financial questions. Of course, as we already know,

our president has come away with about two-and-a-half billion dollars, or the equivalent of it, as a result of these two visits.

[Zholkver] You have in mind the credits?

[Sidorova] At all events—yes, that is the amount of credit that we are to be advanced. But, first of all, I would like to say straightaway that we ought to think about how we will use, how we will spend this money because, unfortunately, there have of late been very many examples of us receiving credit, receiving some kind of assistance, but this assistance disappears into the sand. That is the first thing.

The second thing which I consider very important is the fact that we cannot just think about today. Together we must look ahead a bit and think of tomorrow. Tomorrow depends on the political capital which we gradually build up today, by winning new allies. I would like to say, on the evidence of the latest visits and the agreements which are being prepared, that indeed we have won new political allies. I would say this about Germany. I would also say it about France, judging by the new treaty we have signed with that country. The treaty says that France and the Soviet Union regard each other as friendly states. In other words, it states plainly that we are indeed political allies. There is a similar reference in the treaty with Germany, and I think that the new agreements—or declarations, as they will probably be called—with other European states will in fact be steps toward winning new allies.

[Zholkver] Well, the visit to Spain was in fact the first by a Soviet head of state. How do you assess the significance of these visits, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich? I mean the economic and political significance.

[Tolpygin] Well, I think that the political outcome of these visits is very significant. Two important political documents were signed. These were the Soviet-Spanish joint political declaration and the treaty on concord and cooperation between the Soviet Union and France. I would draw attention to the time chosen for this visit. We now see that the old structures on which Europe's security were based are collapsing. In general, Europe is passing through a fairly crucial period, since fears are being expressed that certain conflicts which have only been frozen could resume. This applies to East Europe, in particular. Unfortunately, we are already seeing manifestations of a certain degree of tension between individual countries. At the same time, new structures are now being created. The summit in Paris will be particularly important, of course.

[Zholkver] You have in mind the talks which will take place soon, between 19 and 21 November?

[Tolpygin] Yes, between 19 and 21 November. It is very important that on the eve of this conference, our countries—the Soviet Union and Spain, the Soviet Union and France—have expressed agreement on the principal

aspects of Europe's future, the building of an all-European home, or, as the president of France says, the European confederation.

[Zholkver] Yes, here the expressions differ. Gonzalez, I believe, used the term: European architecture. We talk about the European home. There is also the European confederation. But I would still like to return once again to the economic side of this question, especially as you, Galina Eduardovna, have already, quite rightly to my mind, noted that, in this area, we should consider not only the prospects for the future but, unfortunately, the dismal experience of the past, when everything disappeared into the sand. But as far as these credits—the French credit, for example—are concerned, I realize that the 5 billion francs that we have been given by the French on this occasion might not appear all that much—only £1.5 billion. But it is intriguing to note that 3 billion francs are pegged to specific programs, for the purchase of foodstuffs and equipment needed by our food and processing industries. Another 2 billion or so—at any rate 1.5 billion—will go to pay off those debts which we have already accumulated, including debts to France.

It is very important, I think, to note that in the case of France, for example, management has been singled out as an area in which we should be helped; management of various kinds—not just the creation of commodity exchanges, which is in fashion at the moment, but vocational training and employment, for example. France has great experience in these areas. Maybe some of the experience has been bitter, when you consider the large number of jobless. But we will also have to tackle these problems. Do you not think that our contacts are, perhaps, particularly important in these areas, in the training of managers, in the training of specialists on the market economy, commodity markets and the labor market too?

[Sidorova] Yes, I cannot but agree with you on this. I think our partners are acting very wisely in this instance. Some people might think, at first glance, that the actual money which has been made available, or the actual food aid which we are getting, is more important to us now. I do not believe this is so, because we have this unfortunate experience of railcars standing around, without being unloaded, of railcars loaded with food causing congestion on our borders, and still this food never turns up—in the shops at any rate. I do not see it and I think that many listeners will agree with me. So, probably the most realistic aid which our Western partners can offer us—and they do indeed have very great experience in this field—is assistance in training people who can sort out our economy, who can extricate us from the crisis. I think it is no coincidence, therefore, that all our Western partners are now stressing precisely this point. Generally speaking, the West is not in the habit of playing ducks and drakes with money, or squandering it. It must be borne in mind that they understand perfectly well both our objective difficulties and our subjective difficulties. Evidently they suspect that sometimes we ourselves

simply have no idea what will happen to the money we receive in one form or another. Therefore, we were told from the outset—as, incidentally, many of our East European friends have also been told—that, while the assistance and the support will be forthcoming, we should work together in using it. In other words, let us set up these joint universities, for example, or we will—they, rather, will invite our young people, our promising economists, to go there to study...

[Zholkver, interrupting] ...In France. Some 2,000 are expected to go.

[Sidorova] As far as I know, the same thing was arranged during Thatcher's last visit, in June, when she visited the exhibition in Kiev. On that occasion, too, the discussion was about... [changes thought] some agreements were concluded there, both at a governmental level and at the level of individual towns, enterprises, and universities. In other words, I think they were talking specifically about training these minds, our bright new minds who will help us sort out our problems in the near future. I consider this very important because this is a specific way of looking to the future. It will clearly help us in some way to cope with our problems.

[Zholkver] Certainly, if this economic cooperation is direct and sufficiently specific. It seems to me, you know, that the Germans, a very businesslike nation, have acted very wisely in this respect. The agreement on the stationing and withdrawal of our troops from Germany has been endorsed by the Bundestag, last week in fact. There is a section in it which deals with the construction of housing in our country for the troops being withdrawn, for the officers, warrant officers, and their families. Quite a large amount of housing, four million square meters, is to be built. Four house-building combines are to be sent to us. But several hundred German workers will come with them. I think this is very important, you know, from the point of view of passing on know-how. Maybe this will even provide some kind of guarantee, that, on this occasion, the imported equipment will not rust away in our country, but will in fact be used. I hope that it will also function after the German workers have left and their equipment remains here.

However, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich, you are quite right when you say that the new elements in our political relations are very important, and this probably applies now to the overwhelming majority of the West European countries ranging from Spain and France to the FRG and other states. How do you perceive the level achieved in this cooperation and its prospects? I am now talking about political cooperation.

[Tolpygin] I have already mentioned that we are on the eve of the conference in Paris. It is expected that an agreement on disarmament in Europe and on reducing conventional armaments and armed forces will be signed in Paris, as well as a declaration by the two blocs—the Warsaw Pact and NATO. It is intended to set up a

security center, and the two blocs will state that they indeed are no longer adversaries and no longer regard themselves as adversaries.

The system of blocs is becoming a thing of the past, and we can see that the Warsaw Pact has, really speaking, already lost its military significance, and that if the Warsaw Pact retains any significance, it will only be political significance. The West says that there is an outlook for NATO, but I think that this outlook too is not very good. Really, the foundation of NATO is collapsing because the bloc was created, the West says, to counter the Soviet threat, and such a threat does not exist. Of great importance in this connection is the creation of the new structures to be discussed, and European cooperation will be given effect in this area too.

[Zholkver] [passage omitted] We have already mentioned that a treaty on good-neighborliness and cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union has already been prepared. It will probably be signed in November. This will also reflect these new structures and the creation of a center for averting and settling conflicts in Europe, about which you spoke, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich. This will also come into it partly. Afterward there will probably be some kind of contacts on our part with other countries.

[Sidorova] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, I should like to add the following point. Indeed, we are also receiving letters from readers who are somewhat concerned about the development of events and the unification of Germany, but I should like to draw attention to a very important and, one might say, cardinal changing point in the treaty—namely, the fact that the Soviet Union and Germany are undertaking in their treaty that in the event of aggression by a third country neither of them will give assistance to the aggressor.

[Zholkver] You mean the treaty which was initialed and is due to be signed?

[Sidorova] I mean the treaty that was initialed and is due to be signed. It will put our relations with Germany on a totally different level. Germany, you see, is remaining a member of NATO, although I should like here to say that in the new situation, NATO is finally acquiring the form that it was given at the start. The Soviet threat was, of course, one of its causes, but only one of the causes. NATO is in general a defensive alliance, and NATO at last will become precisely a defensive alliance. In the given instance, even Germany's membership of NATO will not be at variance with the point in the treaty with the Soviet Union.

[Zholkver] Aleksandr Mikhaylovich is smiling. Do you share this point of view?

[Tolpygin] Yes, I share it. I am smiling because this theme is in general being discussed in the Western press and among Germany's NATO allies. It has given rise to

some criticism. They believe it is to some extent at variance with Germany's commitments within the NATO alliance.

[Sidorova] If we are no longer adversaries, it means that there are no inconsistencies here.

[Tolpygin] This indeed testifies to the new situation in Europe.

[Zholkver] I have heard that drafts are being prepared for similar treaties with Britain, I think, and Italy. So Europe is indeed changing.

[Sidorova] I think the Soviet Union is interested in these agreements and our bilateral links developing in parallel, as it were, with the process that is taking place within the CSCE, that is to say, within the framework of the Helsinki process, because we have for a long time been speaking of new European structures, and sometimes it is not quite clear even for ourselves what these new structures are, and what these new formations are, and whether there will be a need for more such bureaucratic organizations. But in actual fact...

[Zholkver, interrupting] It is said that the secretariat will be minimal.

[Sidorova] It is said that the secretariat will be tiny, but it seems to me that these new agreements and new relations taking shape between us and West Europeans are precisely the basis of this new Europe.

[Tolpygin] The meeting of EC leaders that took place in Rome at the time of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visits to Spain and France also to my mind had to do with the question of the new Europe. It was a very important and interesting meeting. What decisions then were adopted at it? First of all, the decisions were concerned with accelerating the process of integration...

[Zholkver, interrupting] West European integration.

[Tolpygin] Yes, the integration of the EC. A decision was adopted on introducing a single currency and on creating a central bank, for this purpose.

[Zholkver] But that is not before 1994.

[Tolpygin] Yes, 1994. But this is, after all, a very complex matter. The decision was adopted by 11 countries of the EC which comprises 12 countries in all. Britain assumed a special position.

[Zholkver] In Britain itself, following Thatcher's return from Rome, there was the resignation of Howe, her deputy prime minister, who was for many years foreign secretary, who does not share, as he put it, Thatcher's anti-European position.

[Tolpygin] It must be said that Thatcher found herself isolated at the conference, but at home she finds herself in no better position, because opposition to her policies is mounting. I am not here talking of the opposition

Labour Party. In the Conservative party too, pro-European attitudes are increasing.

The EC is thus continually striving for unity, and a decision of great importance was to also speed up political integration. The EC is moving toward a political union. All these processes are, unfortunately, in contrast with what is occurring in our country—in the Soviet Union. West Europe is getting rid of customs posts and introducing a single currency, while in our country it is just the opposite, with republics declaring that they wish to introduce their own currency and that they intend to erect customs posts, and in some places these customs posts are being erected. We do of course have different situations, but nevertheless the example of Europe says a lot.

[Zholkver] It seems to me that we have devoted so much attention to Europe. Yet during the visit to Madrid and Paris, and in the past week, a great deal of attention was devoted to events in the Persian Gulf. These issues were discussed by the leaders: by the leader of our country, our president, in talks with heads of state and government in Spain and France. The visit of Comrade Primakov, special representative of the president and member of the Presidential Council to several countries aroused much attention. U.S. Secretary of State Baker has left for a tour of the Persian Gulf and some European countries.

How do you see the connection between the new thinking, new outlook which is clearly gaining ground in Europe, and the ability to achieve the peaceful settlement of the most acute problems in the Near East and the Persian Gulf?

[Sidorova] Frankly speaking, I am not quite sure that we will be able, anyway, to reach a peaceful settlement, though this is what is most desired. Probably, all realistic thinking people and political leaders would prefer such an outcome.

Truly, much time was devoted to this subject during the president's visits. In the next few days a meeting will take place between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and Baker, the U.S. secretary of state, and I think that this issue will also be seriously discussed there.

But what I would like to underline is that probably for the first time, due to the new relations with the United States, and the new situation being created in the international community as a whole, we, as well as the whole world community, notably the United Nations Organization, are taking a stand. Perhaps not entirely as a united front, but we are more or less close to taking a united stand against the aggressor.

It seems that for the first time what was written down in the UN Charter is now being practically implemented. This is also proved by the resolutions that have been adopted unanimously by the permanent members of the Security Council.

I think that, probably, the main thing at present, and this is my own opinion, somebody may not agree with it, is to maintain this unity, this unified position of the United States and the Soviet Union, to maintain the unified stand of the members of the Security Council—I would say the unified and rigid stand, because aggression is aggression.

One can think up a mass of excuses, as some Arab countries are making up, and as it has been done in Iraq, excuses that, so to speak, helped Iraq to carry out this aggression. But I think that there can be no excuse for this. A lot in our future development will depend on how much the world community maintains its stand, on how it will react to the aggression and on whether it will be able to repel the aggressor.

[Zholkver] Do you, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich, consider yourself an optimist or a pessimist on this issue?

[Tolpygin] I would say that I am, in fact, a moderate optimist. I agree that the stand should be rigid because, actually, an aggression has taken place and there is no forgiving such an aggression. Nevertheless, I think that every single chance should be undertaken to resolve this conflict, this crisis by peaceful means.

We just have no idea what the consequences of such a war in the Persian Gulf would be like. Well, we have published in our newspaper a scenario of such a war. It

was written by a journalist of the magazine STERN. He wrote it on the basis of research by scientists, notably by the Stockholm Institute of Strategic Studies, and by others. He showed that there would be not only massive casualties on both sides; chemical weapons could also be used against third countries. To top it all off, the destruction of oil fields would produce the greatest impact on the world economy.

There are already signs of recession in the West, in particular in the United States of America. It will eventually also affect our economic situation. Therefore, the consequences in this case are absolutely unpredictable. That is why the position should be rigid, but efforts should be taken to preserve peace.

[Zholkver] I think that, summarizing our discussion, I may state that developments during the last week both in Europe and in the world as a whole, including in the very tense region of the Persian Gulf, have shown that, anyway, the future is for the policy of new political thinking, for the policy of reasonable compromises, for the solution of problems by peaceful means and by negotiations.

We finish our program on this. Allow me to thank the participants: first and foremost, Galina Eduardovna, for whom, if my memory does not fail me, this was a debut in our studio. Best wishes to you, dear listeners.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Baker To Meet in Moscow 8 Nov

LD0311142790 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT
3 Nov 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelyov]

[Text] Moscow November 3 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will meet in Moscow on November 8.

The changing of the venue of the meeting, which previously was planned to be held in Geneva, is connected with a programme of Baker's tour of the Middle East and Europe which begins today, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS.

During the Moscow talks, Shevardnadze and Baker will discuss the Gulf crisis, some issues dealing with the treaty on conventional armaments that need finishing, as well as some other problems. The treaty will be signed at the November all-European summit in Paris.

According to the Foreign Ministry spokesman, a meeting between James Baker and President Gorbachev is now being considered.

The U.S. Secretary of State will arrive in Moscow on November 7. It will be their 19th meeting, beginning with 1989.

Petrovskiy Meets With Visiting USIA Director

LD0311214590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 3 Nov 90

[[Interview with Bruce Gelb, director of USIA, and V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, by correspondent Beletskiy in Moscow on 3 November—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze today received [Bruce] Gelb, director of the U.S. Information Agency, USIA, who arrived in Moscow to take part in the fourth Soviet-U.S. meeting on information and cultural exchanges.

The intention was expressed to deepen and develop information and cultural contacts. The USSR foreign minister proposed amending and supplementing the text of the general agreement on contacts, exchanges, and cooperation in the field of science, technology, education, culture, and other spheres, and also the program of cooperation and exchanges for 1990-1991 along the lines of the further development of cooperation at all levels.

Gelb noted that the U.S. Administration takes a serious attitude to the task of lending practical assistance to perestroika in the USSR, including in the sphere of information and cultural exchanges.

[Beletskiy] The obsessive cliches of the enemy image, attributing practically all the changes in the world to the

intrigues of Uncle Sam or to the omnipotent hand of the Kremlin have receded into the past, and one would like to believe that they have gone forever.

Under the new conditions of our countries drawing closer together, fruitful links and contacts are being established and new possibilities for cooperation are opening up.

The participants in the meeting—representatives of the Soviet and U.S. Governments, diplomats, journalists, publishers, and cinematographers—essentially are elaborating new approaches to media coverage of our country and our peoples and are furthering the creation of an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust.

I will remind you that as a result of previous meetings, an agreement was concluded on the opening of cultural centers in Moscow and in Washington, while a correspondent's point for the Voice of America radio station is already operational in our capital.

Thematic groups began work today, intergovernmental ones, on television and radio broadcasting, the printed product, the cinema, the study of public opinion, and marketing. The meeting will last until 5 November.

[Begin recording] [Gelb, in English with superimposed Russian translation] We are focusing attention on ensuring greater possibilities and more openness with respect to the work of journalists, both in your country and in ours, especially as far as access to information is concerned. We think that it is in the interests of all of us for journalists to have the opportunity to cover information freely and to disseminate it.

[Beletskiy] What can you add to that?

[Petrovskiy] I would like to add to what director Gelb said. I would like to stress just one thing, that this is our fourth meeting numerically, but, essentially, it is our first meeting since the Helsinki meetings of our leaders, of Gorbachev and Bush, at which an agreement was reached on the transition to partnership, and these are the first meetings that will take place in the spirit of partnership and will examine the state of our information and cultural exchanges, and at the same time will try to reveal new spheres for agreement which [words indistinct]. [end recording]

U.S. Defense Cuts Called Not 'Substantive'

PM0211143990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

["Commentator's Column" by V. Vinogradov: "Well-Trodden Path"]

[Text] On the eve of their recess in connection with the coming elections, the House of Representatives and Senate adopted the final version of the bill on the country's military budget. It stipulates that U.S. military spending in the new fiscal year—which started 1 October, incidentally—will amount to \$268 billion (not

counting the cost of Pentagon operations in the Gulf). If one concentrates purely on the figures, this sum is \$18 billion less than requested by the Bush administration and \$15 billion lower than last year's military spending.

This year the U.S. Defense Department's budget request was painstakingly studied by various committees of both houses of Congress. And a number of legislators expressed the definite opinion that, under the conditions of the end of the "cold war," Washington could quite easily have embarked on substantive military spending cuts and opposed the continuation of such costly programs as the creation [sozdaniye] of the B-2 strategic bomber and the ATF fighter, or the further development [razrabotka] of SDI.

However, the Bush administration ultimately managed to defend what it saw as the most important military programs, although some of them have been cut back. Thus, the Pentagon has obtained \$2.7 billion for "Star Wars" (having asked for \$4.7 billion). The sum allocated for land-based ICBM's has also been cut. Although the administration had requested \$2.2 billion for the production and rail-mounting of MX missiles, the Pentagon will get \$680 million. A sum of \$202 million is allocated for the creation [sozdaniye] of Midgetman ballistic missiles. Under the bill the U.S. Armed Forces are to be cut by almost 80,000 men. But it was specially stipulated that the reduction in Armed Forces numbers should not affect the overall condition of U.S. troops.

In this respect the statement made by U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney the other day in Pittsburgh is of definite interest. As he put it, at a time when the "threat of a sudden global war has evaporated," the United States will "purposefully review over the next two to three years the basic premises on which its military power is based." In this connection he expressed the idea of adopting a "new scenario for the formation of the Armed Forces" and of focusing efforts on developing "regional military contingents" such as the grouping currently in the Persian Gulf.

In general, the views expressed by S. Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, prevailed in defining the cuts in the U.S. military budget. It was he who resolutely opposed radical cuts in Pentagon spending during the ratification of the final version of the military appropriations, citing events in the Gulf and the "modernization of Soviet strategic forces."

It is therefore no accident that certain U.S. legislators believe that the cuts do not wholly accord with the recent improvement in the international situation—that is, they could have been more significant. Thus, in the opinion of Senator W. Roth, the Pentagon's current budget does not reflect the "most impressive political changes in the Western world since World War II," and Congress failed to make the necessary cuts in full measure "owing to a still-prevalent 'cold war' mentality."

For his part, Senator T. Wirth expressed the opinion that the U.S. military budget had been adopted without

taking account of such an important and undoubted factor as the reduction in the "Soviet military threat." "We should continue," he noted, "to insist on cutting military appropriations at least to the average level prevailing before the Reagan administration took office."

In short, and summing up what has been said, it should be noted that, despite the positive changes in the international arena, the U.S. Congress has followed a well-trodden path: Instead of making substantive cuts to military appropriations, it has again allocated many billions of dollars for armaments.

Talks With U.S. on Chemical Weapons Ban Viewed

LD0411174990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1125 GMT 4 Nov 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Nov (TASS)—The first part of the 17th round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on a ban on nuclear [as received] weapons has ended in New York. At the center of the attention of those taking part in this round were a number of issues—amongst which, in my view, a special place is occupied by the preparation of a protocol on inspection for the agreement on the elimination and nonproduction of chemical weapons, signed by the presidents of the USSR and the United States in Washington on 1 June 1990. According to the clauses of this agreement, the preparation of this protocol should be completed by 31 December. The sides succeeded in achieving substantial progress in agreeing a draft protocol in connection with which there are good grounds for considering that work on this important, practical document will be finished within the time limit set.

Also touched upon were issues connected with cooperation between the two countries in the sphere of the elimination of chemical weapons. In particular, an exchange of opinions took place on progress in implementing the Soviet-U.S. memorandum on understanding in relation to the bilateral experiment on monitoring [kontrol] and the exchange of data in connection with the banning of chemical weapons.

As is well known, the USSR and the United States have committed themselves, without waiting for the conclusion of a multilateral convention on chemical weapons, to beginning a reduction of their own chemical arsenals and eliminating the overwhelming part of them. Stocks of chemical weapons must be reduced by 80 percent and each side will maintain only 5,000 tonnes (that is, around 20 percent of the current chemical arsenal of the United States). The elimination will begin in 1992 so that there will be time for special elimination sites to be prepared.

To what does work at the current round of talks testify? First and foremost to the fact that Soviet-U.S. calls for a reduction in weapons are being reinforced by specific, practical steps. Another aspect is of no small significance

either: cooperation between the USSR and the United States in this sphere serves as an example of what our countries can do to satisfy real demands in the sphere of security in the period after the end of the "cold war".

At the same time, attention must also be paid to the difficulties which both the Soviet Union and the United States are encountering in preparing for the mass elimination of chemical weapons. In our country not a single enterprise has yet been prepared for these purposes (a special factory constructed in Chapayevsk has been re-designated for educational needs at the instigation of the public). At the present time the United States has at its disposal just one complex designated for such a purpose (on Johnson Atoll, 800 miles from the Hawaiian islands), and moreover its production capacities are rather limited.

Thus, both countries are still faced with solving complex tasks connected with the location of the necessary enterprises for the elimination of chemical weapons. The fulfillment of this task is connected with a wide range of problems—from the purely technical to the humanitarian. At the same time, it is important to present the public with convincing proofs that such enterprises will not have a harmful effect on the environment.

China

PRC Envoy, Falin Discuss Popov's Taiwan Trip

LD0211220790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1708 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—A meeting took place today between Valentin Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

Valentin Falin stressed the significance of mutual understanding between the USSR and the PRC, particularly at the stage of the current profound changes in international affairs. The CPSU intends in the future to continue to show concern for the consistent development of cooperation, including through party channels, on the firm basis of the accords enshrined in the joint Soviet-PRC communique on the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the PRC.

In this context, the trip to Taiwan by Gavriil Popov, chairman of the Moscow city soviet, and his meetings and conversations in Taipei, were assessed as being counter to the principled Soviet stance which sees Taiwan as an inalienable part of PRC territory and refutes the concept of "two Chinas".

The ambassador, for his part, noted that the Chinese leadership values progress in relations between our countries. For this reason, it would not want any actions to occur that might run counter to the interests of developing good-neighborliness between two great peoples.

'Some Progress' Made in Sino-Soviet Border Talks

OW0411233590 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1300 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Text] Some progress has been made by the Soviet Union and China in their talks for settlement of disputed issues concerning their common boundary. This was announced by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs after the end of the sixth round of talks. The talks began in May 1989. During the recent round of talks, the two sides signed a preliminary agreement on finalizing the Sino-Soviet eastern boundary line along the Amur River, known to China as the Heilongjiang. Then, members of the Sino-Soviet joint committee will start to solve questions concerning the western boundary line. At the same time, another joint committee, the Sino-Soviet Joint Committee on Demilitarization of Border Areas, is also working on these questions.

Yazov Receives PRC Military Writers Delegation

PM0211141790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel S. Kulichkin: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] On 1 November Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, member of the Presidential Council and USSR minister of defense, received a delegation of Chinese military writers who are in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Writers Union.

There was a lively, absorbing discussion of the role and place of artistic literature in shaping the people's patriotic awareness and fostering in the young generation respect for worthy pages in its country's past and readiness to fulfill the civic duty of defending the motherland. Note was taken of the broad opportunities for developing friendly relations between the two countries in all spheres, including the military sphere, and of the importance of preserving and augmenting the good traditions of Soviet-Chinese cooperation for the good of the peoples of the USSR and the PRC and in the interests of world peace.

The meeting took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

Northeast Asia

Debate With Japan Over Kurils Continues

PM0211112590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by Igor Latyshev: "Visiting as a Guest..."]

[Text] Tokyo—Relations with the Soviet Union have recently become a central topic of debate in Japan. The press is writing a lot about it and the country's statesmen and politicians are devoting speeches to this question. A considerable proportion of these statements consists of

sober arguments in support of constructive dialogue, in favor of accords which open the way to the expansion of businesslike good-neighborly relations between the Japanese and Soviet peoples. An example is the program for the expansion of contacts between the public of the two countries put forward by Shintaro Abe, an eminent figure in Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party, last fall and already partly implemented.

At the same time, the supporters of a "hard line" toward the USSR have been markedly activated. The thrust of this line comes down to putting forward as an ultimatum unjustified territorial demands and their tough linkage with questions of economic cooperation between the two countries. For instance, the statements of several representatives of the Japanese government and the content of the Japanese Foreign Ministry's recently published "blue book" which again lays claim, and in categorical form, to the four southern islands of the Kuril ridge are couched in this key.

Tokyo press commentaries attest unambiguously that the leaders of Japanese diplomacy link their hopes of satisfying these deliberately unjustified demands with the Soviet Union's present economic and other difficulties. At the same time, in their political calculations Japanese political strategists have recently been counting increasingly specifically on flirting with Soviet state and public figures who have won themselves renown as political opponents of the CPSU leadership and the USSR president and government and who are seeking support not only within but also abroad. This is borne out by the frequent invitations to Japan issued to our people's deputies affiliated to the interregional group. Over the past year at the invitation of the Japanese side and in a number of cases entirely at its expense (including the payment of air fares in both directions) a whole series of our new politicians, until recently totally unknown, have visited the Land of the Rising Sun.

I think the Japanese side's desire to receive as guests those Soviet parliamentarians is far from selfless: It conceals an entirely specific design. It is from precisely this category of Soviet guests that the inviters count on obtaining public statements which—because of their convictions and their responsible position—neither leading workers of the USSR Foreign Ministry nor representatives of the Union government and CPSU leadership will undertake. And it must be said that these calculations are often justified: In Japan these guests who recently became famous issue precisely the statements which people here want to hear from them.

The interview by Moscow City Soviet Chairman G.Kh. Popov to the newspaper MAINICHI on 21 October this year can serve as the latest graphic example of careless and generous political payment by distinguished Soviet guests in exchange for free trips and a free and easy stay in Japan at the expense of the inviting side. During his stay—not his first—in the Japanese islands the Moscow mayor thanked the Japanese for their attention with his program for "the gradual solution of the territorial

question." The first stage, according to G.Kh. Popov, is the transformation of the fourth southern islands of the Kuril ridge into a "special economic zone." The second is the opening of free access for Japanese to the four islands with a view to their permanent residence and the creation of Japanese enterprises there. The third is the islands' transfer to joint administrative rule by the Soviet Union and Japan so that at this stage the islands are no longer regarded as either Soviet or Japanese territory. And then there should be a final discussion of the question of Japan's "potential sovereignty" over the four islands. Defending the "merits" of his plan by comparison with the direct territorial demands of the Japanese Government, the Moscow city Soviet chairman did not fail in his interview to rebuke the Japanese for their "lack of flexibility," calling their head-on pressure a tactical "error."

It is well known that a bad example is infectious. And the attempts of some of our people's deputies to carry out strange individual land deals with the Japanese and to generously concede during these deals islands which have been Russian since time immemorial and which have become the motherland of thousands and thousands of people have prompted some of our other fellow citizens—scientists and journalists—to similar "initiatives."

What guides those of our public figures and journalists who today are trying to give rise to all kinds of doubts as to the fairness of the political and legal foundations of the postwar political settlement in the Far East? If we are to believe their assertions, they are motivated only by the desire for historical truth. Let that be so. The trouble is, however, that in the search for this truth they ignore the serious historical studies on this question published both in the Soviet Union and abroad. For some reason trusting only Japanese politicians, historians, and journalists, they discount the far more profound and objective studies of other scholars, including many Soviet historians.

Agreeing to Japanese territorial demands with regard to our country based on nonrecognition of the results of World War II and the distortion of the Soviet Union's role in that war is hard to view as the personal business of individual compatriots of ours who have come to the Japanese as guests and are trying to say and do something to please them. This is by no means a personal matter. After all, the Japanese mass media, scrupulously recording such statements, interpret them as symptoms of the USSR's imminent renunciation of the principle of the inviolability of postwar borders, as a manifestation of its inability to continue to oppose Japanese pressure and its readiness to make concessions to the territorial claims which the Soviet side has so far rejected. Seizing on such irresponsible statements, the Japanese press invariably uses them as an argument in favor of the further intensification of Japanese pressure on the USSR. Here illusions are sown in the Japanese public's consciousness to the effect that Japan needs such pressure and it is already producing the desired effect. Thus,

whether some of our compatriots want it or not, their agreement with the Japanese side in its territorial claims objectively merely inflames the appetite of those local politicians who hanker after our lands. And there are no bounds to this appetite: After all, the claims to the four southern Kuril islands are minimum demands put forward by only one section of local parties and public organizations. Another section demands more—that all the Kurils and the southern part of Sakhalin be handed over to Japan. This section of local politicians does not greatly admire the pliancy of our “radicals,” although it praises them for their readiness to concede particular Kuril islands. From their viewpoint the projects for “gradual” territorial concessions lead to “too great a delay” in the transfer of these islands to Japanese control.

The calculations of those Soviet guests who, having spent a few days in Tokyo, seriously believed the local politicians’ talk about “generous” material compensations which the USSR would allegedly receive for territorial concessions to Japan are naive, incorrect, and even deceptive. These promises, aimed at the credulous, come from not very reliable people: either politicians or officials in the foreign policy department who do not have real economic power or the relevant material resources. As for that country’s financial circles which make its economic policy and determine the direction of major foreign capital investments and credits, they so far have no desire to invest significant capital in the present Soviet economy. And not so much because the USSR is not giving way to Japanese territorial demands as because they consider it is not to their advantage.

All this attests to the fact that the gamble on territorial concessions to the Japanese which some of our newfound politicians have been making recently is an undertaking which promises nothing good for our country and people.

The real paths toward improving Soviet-Japanese relations lie in the persistent revelation of the two countries’ common interests in the course of calm, friendly, and mutually respectful dialogue, in the consistent development of economic, scientific, and cultural contacts between our peoples, in the successful completion of the talks which the two sides are now conducting on the conclusion of a peace treaty designed to eliminate much of what has complicated our relations in the past. The forthcoming visit to Japan by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev will undoubtedly lend powerful impetus to useful and important advances in the direction of the gradual development of Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness.

The improvement of Japanese-Soviet relations is a long, complex, and difficult process. These relations should therefore be healed not by foreign policy dilettantes quick to take hasty decisions like the renunciation of the principle of the inviolability of postwar borders but by people who are well acquainted with the history of the question and with the Japanese’s intentions. Responsible

staffers of the USSR Foreign Ministry have recently been conducting intensive talks with the Japanese side within a working group on a wide range of problems connected with the conclusion of a peace treaty. And our visitors making personal trips to the Land of the Rising Sun at the invitation of the Japanese and at Japanese expense should not prevent them from doing this.

Soviets Promise To Repay Debt to Japan

*OW0211001490 Tokyo KYODO in English 2311 GMT
1 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 1 KYODO—The Soviet Union has promised to pay its arrears of debt to Japan within this year, Japanese diplomatic sources in Moscow said Thursday.

The arrears totaled \$430 million at the end of September.

The pledge was made in the fifth round of trade and economic talks between the two governments which ended Thursday, the sources said.

The Soviet delegation was quoted as explaining that the debts have accumulated due to sluggish exports and higher-than-expected imports as a result of reorganization of the external trade sector.

The delegation said Soviet corporations which have fallen into debt will resume payment negotiations with Japanese creditor companies and the Soviet Government will continue efforts to promote exports and curb imports, according to the Japanese sources.

A memorandum was signed at the meeting to secure Japanese technological transfers to the Soviet Union, which is implementing perestroika, or economic restructuring, under the leadership of President Mikhail Gorbachev, they said.

The two sides also agreed to aim at concluding a new trade payment accord for the 1991-1995 period when the Soviet president visits Tokyo next April, the sources said.

The memorandum says Gorbachev’s trip to Japan is expected to lead to a dramatic improvement in Japan-Soviet relations and will play an important role in the further development of bilateral trade and economic ties.

Direct Telephone Links With ROK To Open

*LD0511064390 Moscow TASS in English 0633 GMT
5 Nov 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kopnov]

[Text] Tokyo November 5 TASS—A direct telephone link between South Korea and the Soviet Union will open at midnight tonight, a spokesman for the South Korean Ministry of Communications announced in Seoul.

An agreement between the Soviet Union and South Korea to open a direct telephone communication service was signed in August this year. Coaxial seabed cables linking South Korea with Japan and Japan with the Soviet Union were used to establish the service.

Previously, both telephone and fax communications between the two countries were maintained via third countries, predominantly West European ones, and only seven to eight percent of calls reached their destination at the first try.

Throughout 1989, people in South Korea and the Soviet Union contacted one another by telephone only 657 times. This year, however, the state of affairs radically changed. In September alone, there were almost 5,000 telephone conversations.

Mediating Role, Tension Reduction in Koreans Eyed

*SK3110115690 Moscow International Service in Korean
0900 GMT 23 Oct 90*

[Text] Dear listeners: We will now briefly review the contents of Soviet publications on the question of the Korean peninsula.

The magazine *MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZH-DUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA* has recently carried a special article headlined "The Soviet Union and the Asian-Pacific Region—Evolution or Radical Change?" by Vladimir Ivanov, functionary of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

In the special article Doctor Ivanov says as follows: For our country, the question of the Korean peninsula is historically linked with security in the Asian-Pacific region and with the consolidation of the political stand there.

In case a conflict develops between the two countries in Korea, this can hold up the normalization of the situation in the region for several years.

Thus, the Soviet Union, as a (?mediator) in dialogue between two Koreas and in the DPRK's contact with the United States first and, then, with other countries in the region, can cooperate in forming a sort of southern policy by the North Korean leadership. In actuality, such a policy is already in force. The DPRK's contact with the United States and its desire for normalizing relations with Australia and Japan and for holding dialogue with the ASEAN show this.

One of the concrete steps to reduce the degree of military confrontation on the Korean peninsula is to reduce the frequency and scale of the "Team Spirit" military exercise. It is necessary not to stage the exercise in 1991 in order to create a favorable condition for the high-level talks between North and South Korea. In addition, as progress is made through mutual confidence-building,

the United States and the Soviet Union, with the participation of the two sides of Korea, can agree on freezing the supply of weapons to the peninsula.

What is important is to evaluate the existing military balance for a proper political analysis afterwards. For instance, what is already clear is that the course of turning the U.S. troops' position from that of a leader to a supporter does not necessitate any increase in Seoul's defense expenditures.

Meanwhile, a certain change is taking place in the DPRK stand. For instance, instead of tripartite talks with the participation of the United States as well, which it proposed before, the People's Korea has come to agree on holding bilateral talks with South Korea. In addition, over the question of staging operational exercises, Pyongyang has also come to call for prior notice and on-the-spot inspection along with Seoul.

Progress in reducing tension on the Korean peninsula accords not only with the Soviet and U.S. interests but also with the interests of the two Korean states, says scholar Ivanov.

Mikhail Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in his special article carried in (?FAR EASTERN AFFAIRS), on the Asian-Pacific region and on the situation on the Korean peninsula says as follows:

Today, a very contradictory process is being made in the international relations in the Asian-Pacific region. While a way has been paved to settling regional conflicts, on one hand, the cold war structure still continues to exist, on the other hand, thus making it impossible to take the opportunity to realize regional cooperation on an equal footing. It is necessary to establish a multilateral vehicle for the settlement of the regional issues in the region in order to make participants in dialogue reach an agreement through mutual concession and compromise. The settlement of the Korean question as well should be sought precisely in this point of view.

Director Titarenko has noted that the reunification of Korea in one way or the other, which is an ultimate goal, is something which can be realized, though not in the near future.

He said that, to expedite the process, both North Korea and South Korea should follow the code of conduct which is observed between countries, respect the views of one another, adopt a generous stand, and make mutual relations nonpolitical. At the same time, the future of the Korean peninsula undoubtedly depends to a great extent on the U.S. attitude toward the DPRK. What is essential is that the two sides begin dialogue without putting forth any preconditions. As for U.S. policy on Korea, what is necessary is the rationality to recognize the realistic existence of the two Korean states and to respect the DPRK sovereignty and prestige. This will contribute to normalize the bilateral relations.

Economic Agreement with DPRK Signed

*LD0311095290 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT
3 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow November 3 TASS—The USSR and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) on Friday signed an intergovernmental agreement, switching them to a new mechanism of economic ties. The agreement was signed upon the completion of the negotiations between the two countries' trade delegations here on Friday.

The document envisages that starting in 1991 the USSR and North Korea will transfer to settlements and payments in freely convertible currency and current world prices.

The agreement was signed by Konstantin Katushev, Soviet minister for foreign economic relations, and Kim Tal-hyon, vice-premier of the Administrative Council, chairman of the Foreign Economic Committee and minister of commerce of the DPRK [title as received]. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 0835 GMT on 3 November carries a similar report correcting the DPRK official's titles as: "vice premier of the DPRK Administrative Council, chairman of the commission on external economic affairs, and minister of foreign trade."]

U.S. Troop Withdrawal Reportedly Worries ROK

*SK0411034890 Moscow International Service in Korean
1100 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] As stated in Seoul by General RisCassi, commander of the U.S. Forces in the ROK, withdrawing 7,000 U.S. troops from the ROK will have a minimum impact on the defense capabilities of the U.S. troops stationed there and on the ROK Army.

The withdrawal of U.S. troops from the ROK is a demand of Pyongyang's and was made a long time ago. According to the DPRK, the stationing of the U.S. troops in the ROK resulted in the division of the nation.

However, the U.S. plan to withdraw 7,000 out of the 43,000 troops stationed in the ROK causes worries on the ROK side. In coping with the military threat from the North, it is worried that this will reduce its defense capability.

Near East & South Asia

Bogomolov: 'Symbolic' Military Gulf Role Possible

*LD0311130890 Hamburg DPA in German 1058 GMT
3 Nov 90*

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—Moscow does not rule out military involvement in the Gulf. Oleg Bogomolov, advisor to President Mikhail Gorbachev and director of

the Institute for International Economic and Political Research, has stressed in an interview for tomorrow's BILD AM SONNTAG that this involvement must be small, however, and of a rather symbolic nature.

"The Afghanistan syndrome still has a strong effect here, and we have to take this into account," was Bogomolov's explanation for the USSR's stance in the Gulf crisis.

According to Bogomolov, the Gulf conflict can only be solved by political and economic pressure and "perhaps also by pressure that goes further" on Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn. No one wants a military conflict, but if a peaceful solution proves unsuccessful then "the next highest degree of solidarity between the countries" with regard to the Persian Gulf will be called for, Bogomolov stressed.

Even a smaller, symbolic involvement such as that of Western countries like Japan, for example, would be very important "at the decisive moment." A policy of solidarity of all countries would "mean a completely new quality in international relations because, with this, countries that had previously been separated by a barrier would for the first time find themselves on the same side in this dangerous situation," Bogomolov said.

The interview was pre-released to DPA.

Primakov Reviews Efforts To Resolve Gulf Crisis

*JN0411091290 Cairo AL-AHALI in Arabic
31 Oct 90 p 12*

["Evaluation" by Yevgeniy Primakov, Soviet Presidential Council member, of his "tough mission" granted exclusively to AL-AHALI; place and date not given]

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev has tasked me to make every possible effort to reach a peaceful settlement to the Gulf crisis and to avoid the military solution. I met with King Husayn, Yasir 'Arafat, Saddam Husayn, Andreotti, de Michelis, Mitterrand, Bush and his top aides, Margaret Thatcher and her senior aides, then Presidents Hafiz al-Asad and Husni Mubarak, and finally Saddam Husayn once more.

Our position has been honest with all parties. We are concerned for the interests of the Arabs and all the peoples of the region. However, we do not approve of any one getting a reward or a gain that he does not deserve. On this occasion, I would like to say that President Gorbachev believes resolving the problem of Kuwait must be established through the withdrawal of Iraqi forces and the return of the legitimate situation. He believes that resolving this problem would be a motive for resolving all the problems of the region and establishing a real security system.

We believe that the Soviet role, which I was tasked with by the Soviet leadership, has led, up until now, to positive results, most important of which was effecting a

change in public opinion in favor of a peaceful solution owing to our insistence that there is room for careful optimism.

This mission made the United States hesitant about the military option. I would not say it has stopped, but at least it is hesitant. Also, anti-war feelings have been reactivated in Europe. We are working with clean hands and we are not participating in any game or maneuver. We are certain that war in the Gulf will lead to disasters. Among the results of war, if it breaks out, is that the balance between the Arabs and non-Arabs in the region would be shattered; Iraq's capabilities would be confined; tension and disturbances against Arab regimes would be created, and the Palestine question would be frozen for many years to come, in addition to potential complex problems for Jordan. As for oil production, it will stop for months, probably years.

Let us talk frankly: The USSR position has been clear since the beginning. We denounce invasion and occupation, and demand that occupying forces withdraw without conditions. However, we want to attain this end without fighting because we know the reality of the results which will be caused by war in this region, regardless of what is being said about the balance or nonbalance of military forces. On the other hand, if all peace opportunities were exhausted, the USSR would not object to military solution. However, I affirm unequivocally that we will not participate in the fighting.

I met with all the leaders I have mentioned in the beginning. I talked to other aides and experts. The issue is complicated and interlocked, and one has to be careful when he approaches it so that we do not lose any possibility of reaching a political, peaceful solution.

I was pleased with what I heard from President Husni Mubarak. I have not found any differences between us in this regard. It is no secret that President Mikhail Gorbachev holds President Husni Mubarak in high esteem since they first met in Moscow last May. He feels that President Mubarak is an honest, frank, and truthful president who is concerned for his country's interests.

'Military Specialists' Return From Iraq 2 Nov

*LD0311120590 Moscow World Service in Russian
1030 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] An aircraft from Iraq carrying Soviet citizens, including military specialists, landed at Sheremetevo Airport at 0938 Moscow time 2 November.

The arrival of the aircraft carrying Soviet military specialists who had been working in Iraq was expected on the afternoon of 1 November. For unknown reasons, the aircraft's arrival was delayed.

Soviet Military Experts in Iraq Interviewed

*PM0211171090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5*

[Fourth and final part of "Iraq: 10 Days in October" series by special correspondents Yevg. Bay and V. Litovkin: "General Bannikov and Other Military Men"]

[Text] Baghdad-Moscow—We could not visit Iraq or meet with the people the whole world is talking about—the Soviet military specialists. But, admittedly, we were could not do so immediately—we managed it only after a telegram from the General Staff in Moscow.

A car was sent to pick us up, and there we were, sitting in a room of a two-story villa in a shady garden not far from the noisy Karradah shopping street, talking with Major General A. Bannikov, leader of the group of Soviet military specialists.

The general was dressed in light summer "civilian" pants and a matching beige shirt with rolled-up sleeves—you could not spot him at first glance as a professional military man. Perhaps his neat, short haircut hinted at this, but long hair has long been out of fashion anyway. Anatoliy Vasilyevich smiled:

"Well, do I look like Makashov [outspoken conservative general]?"

We had seen General Makashov, commander of the Volga-Urals Military District, only on television and in newspaper photographs and it was difficult for us to make comparisons, but Bannikov laughed:

"The only thing we have in common is probably the mustache."

The talk turned to specifics.

"We are not advisers," the general explained. "No Iraqi has ever sought advice from us Soviet soldiers as to what he should do and how, neither during the war with Iran, nor before that, nor since.... Our functions are totally different. We are specialists. There is a fundamental difference here. We do not interfere in operational or mobilization plans, or even in the organization and implementation of combat training sessions with personnel. That is terra incognita for us. Our task is merely to provide assistance in the assimilation and operation of military equipment supplied under intergovernmental contracts, to instruct military college cadets in specific theoretical disciplines, and to carry out other, purely technical work."

There was a soldierly vigor and precision about Anatoliy Vasilyevich. He did not leave us any opening for questions, but he was emphatically restrained and equable.

"Believe me, I have excellent, businesslike relations with the Iraqi Armed Forces leadership, we often meet and discuss specific questions of our cooperation, but for anyone to consult me on problems outside the bounds of my competence or for me to ask anyone about the Iraqi

Army's internal affairs?! All that is categorically ruled out. The point does not only lie in particular state secrets or military secrecy, although that goes without saying. It is not a matter of mistrust of one another. It is simply that there are precise norms for the conduct of any military man in another sovereign country, and no one is permitted to disregard them. Even from the standpoint of elementary decency and punctiliousness, if you will....

"None of us has ever been to the front or near it," the general said. "Nor have we visited combat, active units of the Iraqi Army. We have the following system here: If I or another officer from our apparatus is to be able to leave Baghdad and go to another city, we have to submit an application to the Iraqi Defense Ministry at least a week before the trip. And when on the trip we will be escorted and protected from any surprise. It is customary to respect and observe the rules and traditions of the host country. We do this especially carefully."

Our conversation returned to the events of early August.

It transpired that at that time the general and 40 of his subordinates were on leave in the Soviet Union. Bannikov was in Vyborg, vacationing with relatives, when he heard the news of Iraqi divisions' invasion of Kuwait. The only ones to go back to Baghdad were he, a financial expert (someone has to pay the Soviet Army officers, warrant officers, and employees remaining in Iraq), and a personnel officer, who was to draw up documents for personnel returning home after the end of contracts.

From 2 August no Soviet military specialist traveled to Iraq and no military equipment or spares were delivered. The Soviet side is scrupulously fulfilling the UN sanctions.

Bannikov opened his documents.

"At the end of July," he said, "there were 216 military specialists in Iraq. Fifty-nine left for the Soviet Union in August. Then all the women and children left for Moscow on two Aeroflot flights at the end of August. Another 25 people left in September, and a further 38 are going to leave in October. We will be left with only 93, plus 40 translators, whom we cannot manage without, as you realize: None of the military specialists speaks Arabic.

"Of those who have left," the general added, "five left on health grounds or because of family circumstances, and the remainder because their contracts had expired. The people who remain are specialists in the repair and operation of armor and air defense systems, experts on gunnery range equipment—fighting vehicle gunnery training facilities, firing ranges, and rifle and artillery ranges—and those who install target ranges and their apparatus—in short, engineers and technicians dealing with training facilities and simulators.

"Specialists in aviation equipment and lecturers at military colleges and courses whose contracts terminate at the end of this year or next year also remain in the country.

"What is their life like? What bothers them?" the general repeated the question. "You must ask them yourselves. We will fix up a meeting for you."

The meeting was in a modern residential compound in the Salihiyah neighborhood, literally 1.5 km from the "Al Mansur Milya" Hotel where we were staying. True, we were taken by car to make our visit. The fates of the compound, surrounded by a concrete wall, were guarded by Iraqi troops with assault rifles. Inside the courtyard were cars with license plates from all over the world, and we also noticed white Nissan Patrols [four-wheel drive vehicles] with the large white letters "UN" on the side. Vehicles belonging to the UN military mission.

Colonel B. Yermishkin, senior officer of the group of specialists working at an Iraqi plant for the repair of armored equipment, met us. He accompanied us in the elevator to the fifth floor, where Boris Pavlovich's colleagues and comrades—Soviet citizens living in the neighborhood—were waiting for us in his apartment.

What is our colonel's life like in Baghdad?

His apartment has a large foyer, two bedrooms for a single "bachelor," two bathrooms, a kitchen, and a huge balcony, which is also like a room. The total living area is 92 square meters, of which 65 are usable. The equipment includes a large refrigerator with a freezer compartment, a washing machine with several programs, a Japanese color TV, and two air conditioners.

"The Iraqis have given me temporary use of it," the occupier explained. "I could not dream of such an apartment."

It transpired that in Moscow Yermishkin, after 25 years' service in the Army, in the remotest corners of the country—Ussuriysk, Blagoveshchensk, and other Far Eastern garrisons, to be precise—has obtained his first-ever personal two-room apartment, on the Dmitrovskoye highway: just 32 square meters for three people. He has a wife and a grown-up daughter.

What is the colonel doing in Iraq?

"My main job," Boris Pavlovich said, "is to lead the group (seven men plus one translator) instructing Iraqi soldiers, warrant officers, and officers in the repair and competent operation of the Soviet tanks supplied to the country. (Yermishkin did not say what specific types.)

"My duties," he continued, "also include providing practical assistance in the repair of combat vehicles. Teaching modern repair methods and techniques and preventive maintenance of the machine tool stock and ancillary equipment. And, of course, advising the leaders of shops, services, and various departments on particular issues."

Yermishkin's attitude toward the Iraqi Army's invasion of Kuwait is unequivocal. He condemns any aggression, however it is dressed up, and supports the UN sanctions, although they affect him personally and his comrades, but he is categorically opposed to a military solution of the conflict. He is especially opposed to any participation in it by our soldiers. "One Afghanistan is enough for us," he declared.

"And in general," the colonel added, "a military clash would be suicidal not only for the Near East region but also for the whole planet. If the local oil fields catch fire, it will be impossible to stop the conflagration...."

During the course of the evening we were to return repeatedly to the topic of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and to the events which unfolded in and around the Persian Gulf, but in the meantime here are some details from the sphere of the life of our military specialists, which has always been closed to journalists.

Col. Yermishkin travels to work in an air-conditioned bus made by the Swedish firm Scania. He is driven by an Iraqi soldier. The soldier always has a loaded assault rifle at hand. He protects our military men. At the plant his group has been allocated a special room with comfortable furniture, a refrigerator, and an air conditioner. That is where they dine and hold classes and meetings. Their only contact with Iraqis is at work, on specific professional matters. We were not the ones to prescribe this setup.

What has he seen in Iraq? Babylon, Samarra', Karbala', Habbaniyah, and other tourist attractions. As well as the historical monuments and sights of Baghdad, of course. He also went shopping when his wife came to visit. For just two months in three years. He is not "loaded with money." He has not bought video and radio equipment or household radioelectronic goods although the place is full of them—the strict customs rules do not permit their export from the country.

Even in the Soviet Union he has not used the hard currency he has earned to buy a car or a Japanese television—all the money is in the Foreign Economic Bank, and until you have stood for months in kilometer-long lines to get it, you cannot think of all this.

The colonel has never held dollars in his hands and he makes far less than his neighbor—a Canadian Army sergeant representing the UN military mission in Baghdad.

Just how much does a Soviet military specialist, a colonel whose services, so foreign sources claim, along with the cost of the Soviet weapons and combat equipment, bring our country the bulk of its hard currency revenue, make? Almost as much as a Soviet assistant drilling worker in the oil fields in Al-Qurnah—419 foreign currency rubles.

Boris Pavlovich introduced us to his comrades who had come along to meet your IZVESTIYA correspondents.

Colonel Aleksey Strelkov, lecturer and consultant at a military engineering college, delivers lectures, conducts laboratory work and practice sessions with local cadets, and helps them to create training facilities.

Until his assignment to Baghdad Aleksey Grigoryevich lectured at the Armored Troops Military Academy and he is a candidate of sciences. His granddaughter was born six months ago. He has seen her only in photographs. Newspapers and letters arrive only very rarely.

In September there was a case when no one received any letters for almost 26 days. Apparently Aeroflot and the Ministry of Communications would not agree on carrying charges. The Soviet colony virtually went on strike and the ambassador himself had to intervene in this artificial problem.

Another interlocutor—Lieutenant Colonel Gennadiy Shalakin—gives cadets at an Iraqi Air Force college basic flight training, the sort of thing that is done at flying schools and DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] schools: taking off, leveling out, doing a few circuits over the airfield, and landing neatly. The aircraft used are the same as in our country—light trainers. The pilots move on to MiG's, Su's, and Mirages under the leadership of Iraqi or Indian, Pakistani, and Jordanian instructors in units after graduation.

The group of Soviet military specialists also includes translator-officers and Soviet Army employees, engineers, and technicians involved in particularly complex work to repair, adjust, and tune various technical systems. We made the acquaintance of one of them—Aleksey Druzin, an engineer and technologist for the repair of armored equipment who comes from Belorussia.

There are quite a lot of people like Aleksey Ivanovich among the military specialists. And in the long term, if relations between our countries return to normal, we were told, there will be even more. Civilians will take the place of officers, which confirms yet again that our military links are based on technical rather than operational problems.

There was also Major Oleg Ukolov, a translator, graduate of a military institute, and specialist in technical translation, and Soviet Army employee Bagdat Amreyev, until recently a lecturer in Arabic at the Kazakh State University in Alma-Ata.

Bagdat is regarded as a great expert in modern Arabic literature, has taken part in international conferences of Arabist philologists, is writing a thesis on the lexical features of contemporary Iraqi poetry during his free time, and moves in literary circles in the capital. The assignment here is a gift of fate so far as he is concerned.

As we have already said, there are experts on gunnery range equipment among our military specialists. They were represented at our meeting by Warrant Officer

Yakov Shvab. He too comes from Alma-Ata. He has two sons in his native city. He misses them badly.

"Never mind," he smiled behind his mustache. "My contract will soon be over and we will meet up again."

Our conversation took part on the day when U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney was on an official visit in Moscow. Western news agency reports alleged that the Soviet Union would give him full information about Iraq's military potential.

INA, the Iraqi News Agency, issued a statement that was published in all the newspapers and repeatedly broadcast on radio and television saying that "...if the Soviet Union gives the United States the information in question, we will unfortunately be forced to take the actions required by our national security." They include an end to the evacuation of Soviet citizens, especially those who are in on military secrets about armaments, arms deliveries, and Iraq's military industry.

We discussed this statement, especially as, so we learned, the Iraqi authorities did indeed temporarily ban one of our military men from departing for home and turned him back when he was virtually on the aircraft.

"We have never disclosed to anyone any secrets belonging to a third country," they told us. "To suppose such a thing of our military is insulting, to say the least. Moreover, we are not in on any particular military secrets—that has already been repeatedly said and proved more than once. As for our arms deliveries and the specification and performance of the arms, there are no secrets here for serious military analysts. Everything has often been published in the world press. And after the end of the war with Iran in 1989 Iraq itself staged an impressive exhibition of its arms and combat equipment."

We asked them: In that case why do they endure such suspicion? Why do they not leave a country which, against their will, may involve them in a military adventure and expose them to jeopardy? Why are they still cooperating with a regime that has been condemned by all mankind for invading a sovereign country? What keeps them here—duty, high earnings, a reluctance to clash with the Defense Ministry leadership? After all, a plausible pretext for a return home could always be found.

"Earnings are nothing to do with it—you already know what they are," they replied. "It is not a matter of conformism. Not a matter of being afraid of gaining a reputation as deserters. You cannot portray the situation here, as some people try to do, in just two colors—black and white. Everything is far more complex. Our military cooperation did not begin under Saddam Husayn. The first contracts were signed back in the late fifties. It is scarcely expedient to link the present stage of cooperation solely with his aggressive aspirations. Anyhow, we are not the only ones to cooperate with the Iraqi Army."

We were aware of what they were referring to. Before our trip to Baghdad military experts told us that, in addition to Soviet military equipment, the Iraqis have American—Hughes helicopters—and French: Gazelle and Alouette helicopters. Specialists from the Dassault and (Ayr Spasyans) [as transliterated; possible misprint for "Aerospatiale"] firm are still working there. Thomson has supplied computer systems. The FRG has supplied Puma and BO-105 and BO-115 helicopters, the Brazilians have supplied salvo fire systems, China has supplied tactical missiles.... In short, we were assured, only a very ill-informed person could entertain the suggestion that we Soviet military have "trained up" Husayn's army. Nothing could be further from the truth than that allegation.

Just look at Iraq's neighboring countries, the experts continued. Take Saudi Arabia. Just a month before Iraq's "surprise" attack on Kuwait it signed a contract with the United States for the purchase of military hardware worth \$3.1 billion. It includes 315 modern M1-A2 tanks, 30 tank transporters, 175 special trucks, and armored personnel carriers. In addition to this agreement yet another one, worth \$4 billion, was signed at the end of July. This includes [illegible figure] light infantry vehicles, 2,000 antitank missiles, and a great deal else besides....

"Of course, we could withdraw from the military-industrial market," the military specialists told us in Iraq, "but who would benefit by this? Scarcely our country. After all, military hardware is the only thing in which we can compete at present with highly developed countries. If something else turns up, then it will be a different matter."

"We are military men," Col. Yermishkin chipped in to our discussion, "we will carry out whatever decision our government makes."

Commentator Reviews Iraqi Options in Gulf Crisis

LD0311190390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Arabic 1400 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Excerpts] Baghdad is taking steps aimed at defending itself, using a fire barrier against probable strikes from the multinational forces angered because of the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Oil tankers are being deployed along the shores of Iraq and Kuwait, and they could be set on fire if war erupts. For the same purpose, the antitank trenches along the border with Saudi Arabia are being filled with petroleum.

Our commentator, Sergey (?Saugirov) wrote about that. He said:

The buildup inside the so-called besieged castle is continuing in Iraq for quite specific reasons. So far, Baghdad does not intend to recognize that there is no future in its adventure, and it continues to spread fear of foreign threats among the Iraqis. This is one aspect.

On the other hand, there are limits to the international community's patience. The Iraqi regime's insolent disregard of international law and the United Nations provides impetus for firmer steps and measures. The unofficial working group of the armed forces general staff of the United Nations Security Council held a session in New York at the beginning of this week. It discussed issues concerning the settlement of the Iraq-Kuwait dispute. This is one of the growing indications that international legitimacy is increasingly leaning toward using force against the aggressor.

Therefore, under the current circumstances, Baghdad cannot rely on old international relations and political alliances. For example, our country has not only stopped its arms exports to Iraq, but it is also adopting measures to remove the rest of the Soviet experts still there. According to statistics from the Soviet Defense Ministry, 93 Soviet military experts and 40 translators are in Iraq at the moment. Soviet ships carrying military equipment to Iraq have been recalled.

At the same time, the comprehensive sanctions imposed by the United Nations have started to affect the Iraqi economy. [passage omitted]

Is a military explosion inevitable? I do not want to believe this. It seems that the military preparations are of a temporary tactical character. Baghdad cannot but understand that it will lose a military conflict involving the multinational forces. Even if the situation does not come to that, the Iraqi capacity to resist the international economic siege, relying only on its internal resources, is nil. Nevertheless, there is a way out of the crisis. It is the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Solton Comments on Baker's Gulf Tour Goals

*LD0311161590 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Mr. Baker's mission acquires special significance as the ominous shadow of war is hanging over the Persian Gulf. [passage omitted] Many analysts believe that one issue would be the time for a possible use of military force against Iraq, and there are many reasons for such conclusions. Not ruling out, though, the chances for a political settlement, President Bush is making more and more bellicose remarks about Iraq. He said his patience was running out. The leaders of Britain, who strongly support the American Gulf policy, are making similar statements. The leaders of many other countries are inclined to the idea that a war is inevitable and it may start any day. [passage omitted]

The Soviet president's special envoy Yevgeniy Primakov, who recently toured Gulf countries, had an impression after meetings with President Saddam Husayn of Iraq that the Iraqi dictator is beginning to hesitate and think about how to get out of the current situation without big losses. Reportedly, the Iraqi ambassador to

the United States has confirmed this conclusion. He said Iraq was ready for talks about a political settlement. But Baghdad still attaches strings to this readiness, connecting the solution of the Kuwaiti crisis with solutions to other problems in the region.

But it is actively preparing for war itself. In case hostilities start, Iraq threatens to use chemical weapons, to guard itself with a wall of fire and to set on fire the oil tankers off its shores and the anti-tank ditches filled with fuel. In their turn the United States troops are completing their deployment in the Gulf area. United States Marines are holding an exercise on how to storm the shore strip similar to the one in Kuwait.

I think that both Moscow and Washington, as well as other capitals, realize that a war would be a disaster. Thousands of foreign specialists will suffer who are kept in Iraq as hostages. There will be untold victims among the civilian population. And the hostilities themselves will be hardly limited to the area itself. Of course the policy of appeasement of the aggressor is impermissible, but hasty fateful decisions are also dangerous. I believe the United States Secretary of State James Baker keeps this in mind. Hopefully, instead of discussing details of a possible war, he will be looking at least step by step for a political settlement, which will become the main thing of his tour.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Prospect for South African Reform Examined

*MB2510093390 Moscow in English to Southern Africa
1830 GMT 24 Oct 90*

[Commentary by (Yuriy Yuravlov)—read by announcer]

[Text] Are the changes in South Africa irreversible or not? How deep have the democratic reforms in the dismantling of apartheid gone? The following viewpoint was contributed by our observer, (Yuriy Yuravlov):

The relations between the white minority regime and the black majority are gradually withdrawing from a dead end. Both sides display readiness for talks, which is an encouraging sign, but the coordination of forces remains unstable as yet. Each side evidently has its own trump cards and its own weaknesses. So I am not about to make terminative forecasts about the pace and size of the changes.

Let us turn to facts. Two rounds of talks between the government and the ANC [African National Congress] were held in May and August. To a definite degree the talks cleared away mutual mistrust, and mapped out the conditions on which to continue the dialogue, but in essence those were talks-about-talks as the basis of the transition to a nonracial and democratic South Africa and the foundations of a new constitution remain yet to be scrutinized.

But something concrete has already been achieved. The principal laws of the segregation are effective no longer. The only one still there is the Group Areas Act. The State of Emergency has been lifted on South Africa's entire territory, and petty apartheid is fading into the past. An agreement has been reached on the release of political prisoners and the return home of exiled ANC members. Nevertheless, some qualms remain. While making one step forward the South African authorities are making two steps back at a time. While agreeing to a move they immediately set up obstacles or [word indistinct] about 3,000 political detainees are expecting their release in [word indistinct] 20,000 ANC activists still reside abroad and cannot ever come back. As is the case with the elaboration of the constitution, now the government is saying the process will take up about three years. Now it is [words indistinct] to present it for the scrutiny of the white community immediately [words indistinct] strike one as the government's maneuvering. But remarkable actions (?come too). The ruling Nationalist Party has decided at the conferences of its three general branches to open up for the blacks. That means a drastic change of mentality [words indistinct] one of these days the defense minister, Magnus Malan, unveiled the possibility of reciprocal inspections between the representatives of the Army, and Umkhonto We Sizwe [Spear of the Nation], the armed wing of the ANC.

Let us not forget a [words indistinct] joke of the recent times that the mentality of the South African military is as unbending as the walls that surround their headquarters. Jokes aside, the first stone has probably been laid into the foundation of the future desegregated army of South Africa. As the agreements between the ANC and the government included division of the integration of the Umkhonto we Sizwe armed men into the South African army structures. But the [passage indistinct] collaboration of the new basic law. The country is for the first time to [words indistinct] democratic constitutional system. Quite clearly the talks on the matter will be long and painstaking. The white minority does not have the slightest intention of giving in on its privileges [words indistinct] hands are in the air for a division of power among ethnic groups which means that each of the racial groups will resolve its problems and (?a framework) of self government.

Does this mean apartheid will be preserved in some form? How will the principle, one man one vote be implemented? How will the power be distributed in a democratic way? So far questions outnumber the answers to them. One can get an impression De Klerk's policy is scrupulously set out to stick to offensive strategy and holds tight to the reins of power. Upon legalizing the [word indistinct] backed political and public organizations he pushed them into working under unconventional conditions. The government cherishes the hope factions will appear in the ranks of the opposition which will make it possible for the government to maneuver and press for the [word indistinct] political compromises and under these conditions the ANC and other anti

racist organizations will evidently have to introduce changes into their structures and switch over to broad and legal political activities.

A favorable stance in the future talks with the government will be evidently achieved if all the forces interested in the final dismantling of apartheid pool their efforts together.

South Africans Arrested for Smuggling

PM2410154490 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 1

[Report from KOMMERSANT under the general heading "Did You Hear? Did You See?"]

[Text] According to a REUTER report two South African students have been arrested in New York for attempting to smuggle to the USSR equipment used to create nuclear devices, including weapons. It is thought that it was intended for Soviet businessmen.

Release Sought for Soviets Held in Ethiopia

91UF0058A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Oct 90 Union Edition p 5

[Report of an interview with V. Tokin, deputy chief of the African Countries Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by IZVESTIYA correspondent N. Burbyga under the rubric "The World and Us"; place and date not given: "Prisoners of War or Hostages?"]

[Text] "I am appealing to you for help in complete despair. My own nephew, Lieutenant Colonel Yevgenniy Nikolayevich Churayev, served in Ethiopia. In 1988, his group, consisting of three persons, was taken prisoner by the Eritreans. I brought him up, because his own mother (my sister) died when he was five years old. For me Zhenya is a son. He does not have a family, because it broke up when he was serving in Ethiopia.

"I have appealed many times to the Ministry of Defense, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the Congresses of People's Deputies, and to the president of the USSR. But for some reason I have only gotten replies signed by the chiefs of directorates of both military ministries. All of the answers were dissembled or obviously written as a matter of form. In March, I appealed once more to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but there still is no answer...

[Signed] N. Yerkina, Volgograd."

Taking this letter, our correspondent turned to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs for an explanation. V. Tokin, the deputy chief of the African Countries Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs explains:

[Tokin] Soviet military specialists were and are in Ethiopia under an intergovernmental agreement that includes cultural, trade-economic, interparty, and also military cooperation, whose main aim is to provide assistance in strengthening the country's defense capabilities. This, I will emphasize, is not outside the scope of

international practice. For example, there were U.S., French, and Cuban advisers in Ethiopia, and Israeli and Korean advisers work there today. Therefore, we cannot consider our officers to be prisoners of war. Separatists are holding them illegally.

The safety of Soviet military specialists was to have been insured by the host country. But the government was confident that the separatists would not be able to seize the fortified area of Afabet, where our people were actually located. Some of them were able to get out that night of 17 March 1988. But Lieutenant Colonels Ye. Churayev and Yu. Kalistratov and Senior Lieutenant A. Kuvaldin were captured by the separatists.

[Burbyga] Almost three years have passed since then. What has been done so that these people would return to the motherland?

[Tokin] From the very first days, we submitted a request to the Ethiopian Government to provide assistance in their liberation. Inasmuch as we do not have official relations with the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, we made the same request to a number of Arab and Western countries that have any kinds of ties with them. It must be said that almost all of them, although without any particular enthusiasm, responded to our request. But the Eritreans did not agree to contact the mediators. They demanded direct discussions with the USSR. We entered into direct contact with representatives of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, who are located in London and in Washington.... We conducted negotiations with the leader of the front, Isaias Afwerki. We were promised that this question would be examined at the beginning of 1990 at a plenum of the EPLF [Eritrean People's Liberation Front] Central Committee. There is information that the plenum was held; however, the problem that concerns us was not discussed.

The only thing that was promised us is approval to transmit letters from relatives and friends to them. But it is not known whether they are getting them.

[Burbyga] But are they alive?

[Tokin] We have information that they are all living and in good health. Why this assurance? I talked to an American journalist who met them. In her words, the officers are kept in isolation in mountains in the north of Eritrea, close to the Sudanese border. They are living under guard in a small two-room hut. They have a plot of land on which they do gardening. They look healthy outwardly. They have a radio, and they receive newspapers.

[Burbyga] If we do not have official relations with the Eritrean liberation front, then why not use untraditional forms of diplomacy and seek the help of journalists?

[Tokin] There was this idea. But we cannot guarantee the life and safety of these people.

[Burbyga] It seems that all means for the liberation of the officers have been exhausted?

[Tokin] This is not so. We will continue to work with the states that have an influence with the EPLF. Independently of this, we ourselves will establish contacts with the leaders of the EPLF and demand that they free our people.

West Europe

Bogomolov on Support From Bonn, Troop Withdrawal
AU0511102690 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG
in German 4 Nov 90 p 2

[Interview with Gorbachev's adviser Oleg Bogomolov, director of the Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, by Friedemann Weckbach-Mara; place and date not given: "Former GDR: Will the Russians Withdraw Sooner?"]

[Text] [Weckbach-Mara] What do the Soviet Government and the Soviet people expect from Gorbachev's visit to Bonn?

[Bogomolov] We are seeking support for our policy of perestroika and the introduction of a market economy, so that we can overcome the increasing difficulties: At best, credits from the West can ease the supply crisis in the Soviet Union, but they cannot contribute to a real economic reorganization. In order to provide perestroika and the market economy with a chance in the long run, we need something like the Marshall Plan, which existed for Western countries after World War II. Only in this way can the basis for comprehensive direct investments, training support, and the development of the goods production for the population—from the food industry to the construction of new cars and the improvement of the information systems, including the telephone networks—be created. The Soviet Union, for its part, will create the legal basis for securing investments. We are convinced that an East-West cooperation will develop on this basis after the visit to Bonn; for it is also in the FRG's interest that the Soviet Union not sink into chaos, but become a flourishing state.

[Weckbach-Mara] Will the Soviet troops be withdrawn earlier after the visit?

[Bogomolov] I think that the possibility of an accelerated withdrawal of the Soviet troops exists. Both sides must be interested in it. Our Army on German territory is considerably affected by the virus of disintegration. This is also why it is important that the situation will be defused by the accelerated withdrawal of the Soviet troops. For this purpose, we also have to solve technical problems, for example, the immediate scrapping and selling of superfluous tanks on German soil. Moreover, we will be able to solve the problem of accommodations in the homeland with Bonn's help. That is to say: The accelerated construction of apartments for returning soldiers also accelerates the Soviet troop withdrawal.

[Weckbach-Mara] What will the Soviet Union do in the Gulf crisis?

[Bogomolov] In the Soviet Union's opinion, this conflict can only be solved by political, economic, and perhaps by more far-reaching pressure on the Iraqi leader. Surely nobody wants a military conflict; all agree on this. If a peaceful solution proves to be unsuccessful, however, the next degree of solidarity between the countries of the world will be all the more required in the Persian Gulf.

[Weckbach-Mara] Will the Soviet Union participate in a military action?

[Bogomolov] The effects of the Afghanistan syndrome are still very much felt in our country. We have to take this into account. Therefore—I explicitly do not rule this out—there will only be a small, rather symbolical demonstration of our military participation. This would also be very important—after all, several Western countries, for example, Japan, are responding in this manner. Thus, at the decisive moment, which could really occur, a policy of solidarity between all countries is really important. This would mean a completely new quality in international relations because countries that have been separated by a barrier so far would be in line for the first time.

Moscow Enumerates Military Defections to FRG

LD0411234090 *Moscow Domestic Service in Russian*
1600 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Text] Bonn: The Internal Affairs Ministry notes that the FRG registered 53 applications from Soviet servicemen in the Western Group of Forces seeking asylum in the FRG.

Most of these applications—32 of them—came from Lower Saxony, which has a fairly long border with what used to be the GDR. The others come from Berlin and Hessen, and, as a DPA correspondent reports, many of the applications include requests for asylum for the servicemen's families, too.

This is the state of affairs.

Documents Released on Prewar German Cooperation

LD0211204390 *Moscow TASS in English* 1724 GMT
2 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow October [as received] 2 TASS—Declassified Soviet documents on Soviet-German military cooperation in 1920-1933 wipe out another "blank spot" in the history of that time and give an idea of Soviet motives for such cooperation, Soviet scientist Abdulkhan Akhtamzyan told TASS here today.

Akhtamzyan is a professor and head of the General history faculty at the Moscow International Relations Institute. He said that Soviet documents confirm such cooperation and show the scale of this interaction.

Documents indicate that cooperation was not very successful in the 1920s: The two sides could not launch the joint production of weapons.

The results turned [out] to be more impressive when the two countries switched to other forms of cooperation: training specialists and sharing experience between the command of the two armies.

The USSR opened joint schools to test models of military hardware: a flying school near Lipetsk, a tank school in Kazan and a chemical protection centre in the Saratov-Samara area on the Volga.

It follows from the assessments by diplomats and the military that this cooperation was advantageous to the USSR: The Soviet Army gained important experience. Incidentally, the Soviet state did not violate any norms under international law.

The exchange of weapons and experience, as well as participation in war games were a common thing. Mutual visits to military exercises under new historical conditions became a measure of trust between states, Akhtamzyan continued.

The institute of military attaches initiated by Soviet-German cooperation became a generally accepted form of maintaining military contacts. It is quite another thing that Germany violated the Versailles Treaty and had to conceal this cooperation.

At a time when the USSR had no modern munitions industry, the borrowing of military and technological experience was very important. Regrettably, the Soviet Union could not fully use this experience.

Soviet military leaders actively used acquired knowledge between 1933 and 1937 but later were imprisoned. About 40,000 Soviet Army officers were killed between June 1937 and autumn 1938.

Therefore, when the Second World War broke out, this experience was not used. This is the tragic outcome of Soviet-German military cooperation, Akhtamzyan stressed.

The analysis of Soviet Foreign Ministry documents shows that military cooperation was stopped in the spring of 1933 at the initiative of the Soviet side.

TASS learned at the Soviet Defence Ministry that the Soviet and German sides plan a joint publication which will also include materials of the Soviet Defence Ministry.

Scandinavians Cited on Soviet Immigration Fears

PM3110120790 *Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian*
26 Oct 90 *Union Edition* p 5

[Report by M. Zubko: "Will They Close the Borders?"]

[Text] Stockholm—"The crisis in the Soviet Union will soon knock on our door"—under this headline the

Stockholm newspaper AFTONBLADET published on Tuesday an editorial devoted to the problem of the expected influx of USSR citizens into Sweden.

...It cannot be said that this problem only arose yesterday. Since our country's Supreme Soviet started discussing the draft law on free exit from the USSR, it has become clear to the Swedish authorities and public that they will have to encounter questions of "emigration from the East." But here they were really agitated by a report "brought in" by a delegation from the Nordic Council which returned recently from the Soviet Union. According to the estimated figures of which the delegation members were informed by Soviet official representatives, the level of emigration could reach 20 million people.

This mass of people will move to the West, including Sweden. "How will we Swedes react to this?" asks AFTONBLADET. It may be said that the answer worries many people in Sweden. AFTONBLADET again voices the following proposal: Will emigrants not be stopped at the border and sent back and will the notorious "iron curtain" not emerge again, but on the Western side this time? The newspaper believes that "solidarity is being subjected to a great test."

This latter fact can also be sensed in the statements made by representatives of the Swedish immigration administration. The newspaper DAGENS NYHETER attests that they voiced the hope that the Swedish Government will announce clearly and unambiguously its reluctance to give refuge to "economic refugees" from the USSR. This term—"economic refugees"—has already been used in Sweden to describe those of our citizens who will start to leave the Soviet Union because of unemployment, unsettled daily living conditions, difficulties with food, and so forth. Understandably these are so far the hopes of apparatus officials. What the government's decision will be we will learn later. It is to be supposed that debates on this score will not bypass the country's parliament. But in neighboring Denmark, where a bourgeois government rules, discussion has already assumed more specific forms. And what forms! According to a report from Copenhagen, the Danish Justice Ministry has prepared a lengthy report on "the new policy with regard to refugees" which contains proposals for drastically toughening up the procedure for issuing visas with residence permits and the right to work in Denmark.

One can understand those people in Sweden or Denmark who want to introduce order in the immigration business and the fulfillment of rules for entry into the country. But somehow the heart cannot accept the statements of those who are rushing to put huge locks on their borders. After all how many years were needed for the USSR authorities to grant their citizens the right to free exit, the right to travel the planet! How many statements, declarations, newspaper and journal articles, and television programs there have been! And now that the law is to be adopted it is proposed to drastically toughen the visa procedure....

PRAVDA on Gorbachev Paris News Conference

PM0111150090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition pp 1-5

[Unattributed report: "Concord and Cooperation: News Conference by M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand"]

[Text] As already reported, M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand held a joint news conference 29 October at the French president's residence at Rambouillet near Paris. This is the full report of it.

[Mitterrand] Let us begin our news conference. As you have seen for yourselves, we have been at the Chateau de Rambouillet since morning. Mr. Gorbachev and I began our talks yesterday evening in the car en route from Orly Airport to Paris, and continued during dinner which went on until late and then in a private conversation. We met at 10 am today. We came here together. We held talks in the car before arriving here and on arrival immediately began discussing the agenda. During that time the relevant ministers also met for a conference and discussed their own problems so as to finalize the agreements previously envisaged, and they signed a whole series of different agreements. During this time Mr. Gorbachev and I discussed the list of questions which I am giving you now.

What agreements have been signed? A protocol on a financial agreement signed by Mr. Voronin and Mr. Beregovoy. Briefly, the French government is going to give the USSR five billion Francs in financial aid. A program of economic, industrial, and scientific and technical cooperation has been worked out between the two countries for 1991-1995. This program was signed for the French side by Mr. Fauroux and for the Soviet side by Mr. Voronin. It relates to the power industry, petrochemicals, industry, the agriculture and food industry, rail and road transport, electronics, information technology, communications, television, high-definition television, and environmental protection. There is also an agreement between our two governments on cooperation in the sphere of employment, labor, and vocational training. It was signed for the Soviet side by Mr. Shcherbakov and by the French side by Mr. Soisson. The aim is vocational training of cadres for the competitive labor market, that is, the training of specialists on questions of employment, human resources, and trade union cadres. There is also a protocol on cooperation between enterprises in the French and Soviet state sectors. It was signed for the Soviet side by Mr. Voronin and for the French side by Mr. Fauroux. It is envisaged that ties will be established in cooperation between the two countries' state enterprises, for example, between the Soviet Ministry of Power and Electrification and Electricite de France and in vocational training and the exchange of trainees. An agreement between the National Center for Scientific Research and the the USSR Academy of Sciences has been signed for the Soviet side by Mr. Marchuk and for the French side by Mr. Kourilsky. The aim is the

elaboration of joint scientific research programs, information exchange, joint laboratory work, and international programs in scientific cooperation.

And, finally, a while ago, just now in fact, Mr. Gorbachev and I and the French prime minister and the two states' foreign ministers signed a treaty on concord and cooperation. This treaty assumes special significance by virtue of the scale of the problems posed but also has a particular aspect because it is many years since a treaty of this kind has been signed. To be more specific, we have not signed a document at this level for about 10 years.

The main questions mentioned during the talks between the Soviet Union and France undoubtedly related to all these problems. And we noted with satisfaction that we have been able to make progress so rapidly and so successfully in the most important spheres reflecting the significance which the two sides attach to them in the development of our relations.

During the talks we broached various political questions connected with the treaty on concord and cooperation. We talked about the development of Europe, about the new equilibrium that is appearing on the horizon, and about the CSCE summit which will take place 19-21 November. We talked about how to prepare for that meeting and how to act in the situation which follows it. Finally, we talked about the Persian Gulf crisis. Those were the political questions. I have already listed the economic agreements. Those are the facts, esteemed gentlemen, on which you will be able to base your questions.

But perhaps Mr. Gorbachev, whom I have had the tremendous satisfaction to receive in our country again, to whom I again extend our cordiality and hospitality, and to whom I want to wish success, perhaps he would like to say a few introductory words? I want to thank Mrs. Raisa Gorbacheva, who is here accompanying the president on this trip. All that I have talked about marks a new stage in relations between the Soviet Union and France, whose significance, level, and future prospects please us. I thank you, Mr. President: Would you like to say a few words now?

[Gorbachev] Your speech was so good that it makes my task very easy. To a considerable extent I could and can go along with what President Mitterrand has said. Yes, indeed, we have managed to keep to the time limit planned for this meeting because we did much work in advance, which has made it possible perhaps to achieve such major documents in our cooperation for the first time. The president ended his report by assessing the signing of the Treaty on concord and cooperation as the major event in our relations over the last 10 years at least. I want to begin from that point and stress that we arrived at this document by a logical route. Generally speaking, going back into history a little, it must be said that we have had political declarations of this sort before. But they were not always embodied in policy nor

became firm guidelines. In this instance, however, moving over these past years toward this bold document, to put it bluntly, we showed, if you will, wisdom, caution, and thoroughness. This document is extremely promising for cooperation between our peoples and our states. I fully share the high appraisal which the president gave it.

During my time here we have held at least four conversations. Essentially, we have held nonstop talks at the same time as talks were being held between the foreign ministers and all the delegation members. Much work was also done in the final stage before arriving here. And the fact that was done quickly also reflects the new level of cooperation and mutual understanding between the leadership of the two countries which makes it possible to discuss the most important questions effectively and achieve results which are then enshrined in the corresponding accords.

Mr. Mitterrand mentioned the themes of our conversations. I would say in confirmation of his report that, yes, at the top of our agenda is the question or problem of the present day and of the global changes which have made very high demands on world politics and politicians. What is that question? Thanks to the present generation of politicians, who have managed to express the mood of the peoples, we are leaving the cold war era and entering a new phase. We hope that this will be a phase of effective peaceful cooperation. But those same politicians also bear a responsibility, particularly in the initial stage, to control the new processes which, as you can see, have immediately been subjected to serious tests. We have discussed that. The president and I surveyed the changes and alterations in the arrangement of forces and the regrouping of interests in the framework of the world process already underway. And from that viewpoint we looked at the role of France and the Soviet Union and the role of Soviet-French dialogue. It has always had a significance of its own. We believe that the experience of cooperation and the intellectual and political level at which it has taken place in recent years enable us to hope that the Soviet-French factor will play an important role at the new stage of European and world politics, too. We talked about Europe in that context. We talked about how prepared we are, what we are prepared for, and what conclusions we are working toward in connection with the approaching Paris meeting. This is a most important event. The president and I said that everything useful which has been done in the framework of Helsinki-I must be taken with us—as baggage, experience, and achievement. At the same time, it is necessary to reflect in the meeting's documents all the new realities and the new understanding of where we are today, where we are all are together. This is a very responsible task. I would say that we simply cannot allow it to fail. I do not think that it will fail: It is being prepared thoroughly and we can already say that it will be successful. But we want it to be a major success because the issue here is how we are going to live together and cooperate with one another in a completely new historical era.

And, of course, I confirm that the French president and I have talked a lot about the Persian Gulf situation. I can also state that there has been further progress in our dialogue, in the comparison of positions, and in mutual understanding on the most important questions of bilateral cooperation, aspects and the parameters of which were presented here by the president. I can also state further progress in mutual understanding on the major questions of world politics.

I express again my profound satisfaction at the meetings with the French president, with whom I have had a nonstop dialogue in various forms. We both appreciate and value our personal contacts. We talk on the telephone and we correspond. I believe that this is the way to go in the future, too, especially nowadays when the world is changing so rapidly and we are participants in this tumultuous process. We await your questions.

[PRAVDA] President Gorbachev has just told us that you have talked a lot about the Persian Gulf. As the French hostages are, happily, returning home this evening I would like to know what President Gorbachev thinks about that release and what means he intends to use to secure the release of the Soviet hostages still in Iraq?

[Gorbachev] There are bound to be other questions on this theme so I will not go into the entire problem, but whenever we talk about the Persian Gulf and the acute situation which has occurred because of Iraq's aggression and the annexation of Kuwait, it is obvious that we are dealing with a very serious crisis in which everyone is involved. There is much here that worries us. Because this is taking place at the very beginning of the restructuring of international relations, as I have already mentioned. It is being subjected to very serious trials.

I think that the United Nations is acting in a spirit of high responsibility toward its members' peoples and the president and I have reaffirmed that we are committed to unity which has come about and will firmly and consistently adhere to cooperation in decisionmaking so that the situation is resolved and that this is done in a spirit of principled approaches formulated by the Security Council. That is the first point.

We cannot allow and must not give any reason to Iraq and President Husayn's regime to think of or hope for discord among those who have adopted these resolutions or for a weakening of positions. No. We are confident that all these decisions were correct and dictated by a high responsibility and concern for peace.

There is also the problem of people from many countries who are working in Iraq, Soviet people among them. Thanks to our efforts and cooperation with the Iraqi leadership a considerable proportion of our citizens have already returned. There are 4,000 people left there now and we are continuing to act in this vein. There is a special government commission at work which is charged with the responsibility of resolving all the problems related to this. We cannot ignore a single person.

And we will fully adhere to this firm approach and put questions firmly and in principled terms to President Husayn and the Iraqi government. We believe it is immoral to use as political hostages people who went to Iraq at the Iraqi government's invitation to help develop its economy in the interests of the Iraqi people and help improve the life of that country's people. We resolutely condemn this form of action and President Husayn is well aware of that. This point was reaffirmed by Comrade Primakov at his meeting yesterday with the Iraqi leadership including with President Husayn. The Iraqi side gave further instructions on the examination of this humanitarian problem, which we consider very important. We will act in a spirit of high responsibility for the lives of our people.

[PRAVDA] My first question is to you, esteemed Mr. Mitterrand, as a most eminent politician. When you became president you stated that you remained a convinced socialist. I would like to know how you, as a socialist, react today to claims about the utter collapse of socialism that are being expressed in both the world's press and, unfortunately, the Soviet press? The second question is for Mikhail Sergeyevich. In the past four days you have met, had dealings, and conducted very interesting talks with two major figures of the socialist movement and the Socialist International: Mr. Mitterrand and Mr. Felipe Gonzalez, who in the past decade have brought their countries to a new stage, a new level, and entered their high posts as socialists. In the past we subjected "their" socialism to critical doubt and analysis and did not accept it. Does it not seem to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that the time has come to review our negative attitude toward the policy of the Socialist International and to the figures of that socialism previously derided by us?

[Mitterrand] You are in danger of making me deliver a quite long and detailed report on this theme. But I must keep my answer very brief and, thus, incomplete. I hope that you will forgive me. I have to say that the word "socialist," the term "socialist" as you know it was born in struggle and in the theoretical search on the basis of the French industrial revolution or, in general, in the second half of the 18th century. However, there were virtually no socialists in power anywhere at that time. They were even persecuted. Every method was used to pressure them, in other words, they had to operate underground. These were, if you will, conditions of war which consequently influenced theoretical developments—dependent, of course, on the peculiarities of the time and place. These theoretical developments had to be put into practice in conditions which were not always the same. But all socialists, not forgetting their different origins, directed their activity toward giving the proletariat and all exploited strata the possibility of using the elements of freedom.

But sometimes they were in different camps; they were divided. Here, in France, there were many theoreticians. Probably there were many in the Soviet Union, too. There was a different socialism there. There was German

socialism, English socialism, Scandinavian experience, and there were others. Therefore, when talking about socialists—and of course this applies to me—one cannot have in mind some common experience of socialist development—for example, a Soviet type or just a Western experience in Europe. These are completely different forms of experience—German socialism, British or French socialism. Therefore, all this diversity, based of course on the initial definition of socialism—you have not yet made me say whether I reject it - well, this diversity, I repeat, makes it impossible to fully assimilate the socialism which developed in the Soviet Union under Lenin and particularly under Stalin or French socialism in the form in which it has been established since the time of Jaures, Blum, or today.

That it is impossible to use a single definition of socialism can also be explained by the fact that we are not afraid of the most strenuous discussions about socialism, sometimes a very acute discussion which began in the Soviet Union at the time when administrative circles, the bureaucracy, and authoritarian regimes stifled all initiative and freedom. In contrast to that we said that socialism is the development of freedom which enables each citizen and each human being to obtain rights and at the same time really feel that he is a factor for progress. That is how I would view—quite rigorously, of course, I must acknowledge—the development of the socialist or, more precisely, communist system in the Soviet Union. And I reiterate that despite the considerable efforts of that people, despite the courage shown by them during World War II, despite their tremendous potential, and their culture, the present leadership will have to show vast courage, vast imagination, and vast intellect to revive Soviet socialism and present it in a new light. I am speaking on my own behalf, I am not trying to lecture the Soviet leaders, I do not mean to teach them what to do.

And, of course, as a friend of the Soviet Union who has managed to meet with President Gorbachev and assess his merits, I am very pleased at what is happening in the Soviet Union now. But I do not think that it would be reasonable to demand that the Soviet leaders study our lesson alone. They must rely on their own experience, their own reality. But I repeat: One can only welcome the intellectual courage with which they are trying to turn their country in a new direction so as to simultaneously combine that which constitutes socialism and the triumph of democracy and freedom with the spirit of initiative and enterprise. This is a revolutionary fusion. I regard what is happening in the Soviet Union not only with sympathy but also with a desire to promote its success and, if possible, if other socialists agree, to make our contribution to the success of this cause. That briefly is what I have to say on this score.

[Gorbachev] Yes, Comrade Fesunenko, you put that question well, but I do not know whether it is appropriate to a news conference. In the past few days, in Spain and now France—you correctly noted—I have had an opportunity to touch on that theme. I kept it in mind.

I have to say that Mr. Gonzalez and I had very extensive conversations. On one occasion we spoke as statesmen, on others as general secretaries: one of the CPSU, the other of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party. Here, in Paris, in my conversations with Mr. Mitterrand this theme has cropped up a number of times.

I would like to start with this point. There is a definite phenomenon here. A phenomenon which gives us all food for thought. We in the Soviet Union have embarked on profound changes embracing all spheres of life: the economy, policy, the sphere of democracy, the civilian society, and the sphere of interethnic relations. The question that arises is one of guidelines, aims, and the kind of society that we are seeking. And all the time we, the country's leadership, and I personally am asked the question: Are we going through all this toward socialism or away from it? Here is a phenomenon: A people who have passed through complex phases of development since the October Revolution connected with the existence of a totalitarian regime, Stalinism, the repressions, a people who have experienced all this drama and have not lost, but, on the contrary, have preserved their commitment to the socialist idea and the socialist choice. A remarkable fact which cannot simply be ignored, no matter how hard one tries.

It is impossible to casually discard one form and adopt a completely different one, another model, borrowing it and offering it to a society, so to speak, urging people to mechanically copy someone else. That is not the right way. And I fully share Mr. Mitterrand's idea that we must first of all acknowledge each people's right of choice, the socialist choice and the right to decide their own destiny. No one can deny the people that search. These are their sovereign rights. Yes, this search has always been accompanied by the appearance of political parties and tendencies, the political struggle whose character depends on the level of democracy, political culture, and the general culture of society. That is all so. But I merely want to stress in this instance the people's sovereign right.

We are moving away from the utopian model which was artificially imposed on our society and was accompanied by phenomena of a totalitarian character. This alienated man from ownership and demeaned him. And, of course, it was contrary to the ideas of October: land to the peasants, factories and plants to the workers, and power to the working people. Generally speaking, the very point of October was to overcome man's alienation from power, the means of production, the land, and culture. The things that began then, in Lenin's day, in difficult searches (even though things did not go completely smoothly or easily back then), unfortunately, did not take place, were not continued. We must return to all sources but with a new understanding of the values connected with the socialist idea and general human priorities. Because socialism does not deny general human values but organically includes them. That was Lenin's idea.

That is what we are now doing. Through democracy, glasnost, and political reforms we are restoring people to the political process as the main characters in it. Through the reform of property relations we are dealing a blow to the monopoly of state ownership and the command system and once more restoring man to the process as the main character and activating his interests and incentives. To sum up—this is a question of freedom, justice, and a reliable society for the working man so that he feels at ease in that society.

It all seems simple. But it is a very complex path. We are moving away from barracks socialism, the domination of totalitarian methods, and a rigid regime toward a democratic, humane socialism.

Now for part two of your question. To be honest, Comrade Fesunenko, I do not understand why you say: Is it not time for us to look at foreign socialist experience. Not only is it time.... And these—as you must know—are not merely words. After all, we realized that need even before 1985. We have long been developing fruitful ties with socialists and the Socialist International. The CPSU maintains regular ties here. There is an active dialogue under way with socialists in Western Europe. I have in mind Mr. Mitterrand, Mr. Brandt, Mr. Gonzalez, and many others. And this is a very useful dialogue. Although, of course, there cannot be a "socialist pattern" the same for all. That would be another mistake.

We must realize our commitment to the socialist idea in the real context of our society—in the light of its entire history and all its characteristics. And this process, I must say, is not proving easy. Some people have even tried to sound socialism's death knell. I am not one of those people. I am a convinced adherent of the socialist idea and will act in accordance with it. That is known both in the country and the world. But this does not stop me from being open to contacts and dialogue with all other political tendencies both within the country and abroad. Yes, we are one civilization. We are very much interdependent and each people has its own experience which deserves respect. That is what I wanted to say on this topic.

[PRAVDA] President Gorbachev, people often cite your words that there are signs that Iraq might renounce its policy of ultimatums. Do you confirm those words after Mr. Primakov's mission to Baghdad and if so, what are those signs? And President Mitterrand, the press has written that you have said that an armed conflict could break out in the very near future. Did you really say that? Do you still think so now?

[Gorbachev] You have asked perhaps the hardest question. I would like to answer it with the utmost frankness. I am speaking for myself. But I must say right away—the president of France and I have found a high degree of mutual understanding on this question. We consider the world community's actions regarding the annexation of Kuwait and Iraq's aggression to be justified. And we

must do everything to ensure that this unity is maintained and strive to ensure that the world community's demands are fulfilled. I think that even though U.S. troops and troops from other countries are now stationed in the Persian Gulf region and in Saudi Arabia, the issue is nevertheless one of a political solution. In my view, the military solution to the problem is unacceptable to us all. But President Husayn should not try to exploit that. We must do everything step by step to make that country's leaders understand that they are acting against common sense and are exposing the world and their people above all to danger. This can only be called adventurism. Everything must be judged bluntly and openly here. By acting on a united front against aggression, we are simultaneously seeking a means of reaching a political solution—by exerting pressure using the various possibilities and taking part in a political search.

You ask what the Primakov mission has shown? First and foremost that this is not an independent branch of the process. Furthermore, it is not an opposing part but an organic part of our common efforts. There are many visits, meetings, and conversations like this in progress. They are being undertaken from various sides—some openly and well known to the press, others behind closed doors. But it is necessary to act more quickly before the situation gets out of hand.

At 5:00 a.m. today I received a telegram from Baghdad. Meetings have been held there between Primakov and the Iraqi leaders. In the past few days, incidentally, conflicting information has reached us from the press that under pressure of circumstances and primarily of the unity of the United Nations, which is being and will continue to be maintained, and as a result of the tough sanctions which may possibly increase, certain signs have appeared attesting that the Iraqi leadership may finally yield to common sense and the voice of the United Nations. Yes, Primakov's conversations show that President Husayn's position has changed from what it was some time ago. Baghdad, it seems, has begun to reflect. I think that the sooner the Iraqi president understands and moves toward the appeals of the Arab countries and the UN Security Council, the sooner this dangerous problem will be resolved by political approaches.

All this does not mean that we are changing our position. No, it remains the same. We are searching. And I think that the time has now come to really activate the Arab factor. Certain positive changes are possible in that regard. I admit and even hope that this is so. This would be the most acceptable form of search for all of us. But, I repeat, there are demands which must be met. They are well known.

Thus, we favor a solution by political means. But the situation is deteriorating and everyone must work actively. If President Husayn is hoping to split, divide, or find a crack in the position of the UN Security Council's permanent members, he is deluded. And policy cannot be founded on delusion.

[Mitterrand] I would like to answer your specific question to do with statements attributed to me. I always fully confirm the things that I have actually said but I have always repudiated and still repudiate those that I did not say. Incidentally, there are quite a few assertions of this kind and it is worrying, I can assure you. Let us leave this matter here.

Your question, however, does touch on the nub of the problem. I repeat to everyone (more than once), including representatives of the press, that the main facts of the problem that faces us have not changed significantly since 2 August. I can see perfectly clearly how events are developing which might lead to armed conflict. And so far I see no signs of any other process. With the exception (and this "exception" surely acquires a most substantial significance now), with the exception of what will happen if the decisions adopted by the Security Council are implemented across a united front, if the unity of the Security Council's permanent members is constant, and let there be no doubts about the clarity of the principles expounded, whose implementation and the fulfillment of demands could mark a new stage [as published]. On the one hand, there is the embargo, on the other, the constant repetition of certain simple truths which are well known to you. Their main thrusts are these: unity, firmness, and the fulfillment of the measures on which the Security Council's decision was adopted. All these areas, undoubtedly, do not rule out our striving for a peaceful solution. Quite the reverse. That is precisely why they were adopted. For the sake of a peaceful solution, which in accordance with international law would restore respect for human rights and the independence of states, everything which ensures the affirmation of peace can only be welcomed by us. And, undoubtedly, everyone must do everything in his power to ensure that he is not diverted from his path.

[PRAVDA] Mr. Mitterrand, in connection with the forthcoming all-European summit conference, could you tell us a little about the idea of the European confederation and how it fits in with the idea of the common European home?

[Mitterrand] You know, I do not want to launch into a long commentary here. Taking into account the new map of Europe, the end of the cold war, and the beginning of cooperation between what used to be called West and East, it must be deemed completely obvious that even if the Western countries had insisted absolutely fairly on their path, that is, on the unity of Europe, the building of the European community, and the drive toward the single market which will occur in a while, there are still quite a few countries and peoples who now have no absolutely clear guidelines. They may feel isolated, they may sense a new need for considerable efforts to restore their economic position. Therefore, the solidarity between the different European countries is perfectly normal—and let us forget about the terms west, center, and east: All countries have an equal right to consider themselves Europe. They share the same ancient history, a long history. Let us consider that they must now leave aside the things which hindered them and look at how they can all embark together on the

common construction. How they can achieve peace and progress in Europe. So long as the dignity of each of us is respected, of course. This dignity is being observed within the European community of the twelve. The weight of the so-called small or poor countries—I would mention Ireland, Portugal, or Greece as examples—their weight in the adoption of common decisions with the help of the right of veto is as great as that of the FRG, Britain, France, Spain, or other states. Things will be exactly the same in the Europe of the future, the Europe of tomorrow.

Without resorting to those strict conditions which are not accepted by all but which do undoubtedly operate in the community and which demand the strictest discipline, certain structures for the joint examination and discussion of certain common questions could be defined. And believe me, there are quite a few of them, for example, questions concerning different models. The United States and Canada are participating in this work with great benefit. Or questions connected with the renunciation of armaments, with permanent structures, and so forth.

All this demands the most careful and continuous exchange among us. When I spoke on questions of European confederation to the French people last 31 December it was precisely this that I recalled with respect to Europe. I have already had the opportunity more than once to uphold the concept of a common home. Mr. Gorbachev and I have upheld the same ideas, although the procedure for their implementation may be different. And this has to be talked about more. Or, say, the ideas advanced by the Czechoslovak president and Polish parliament. Such ideas are now springing up everywhere: How to organize Europe, the continent of Europe, within a community of states which form that community or those states which are engaged in free commercial exchange—the "six," for example, or the "seven." But, in the first instance, of course, we are talking about a Europe of which the Soviet Union is the biggest component. And this is envisaged even within the framework of the agreement which we have signed.

I will not enter into specific economic computations here: That falls within the competence of parliaments' activity. Until the European Parliament has examined this I will not provide any economic realities. But I will permit myself to say the following: The documents do contain provisions on regular consultations and meetings. And not just at the level of ministers, but at the level of experts. I want therefore to say that it is essential to begin to realize now that Europe in its present form is not represented by any bloc or blocs. It is a place where countries meet on common themes—scientific, technical, environmental, economic, and, in the final analysis, political themes. It suffices to make reasonable efforts to achieve united stances. That is what I want to say on the question of confederation. A confederation means that there is a common power divided among a number of partners who are connected by a single center. Of course, the center should be much stronger than in a federation, although less strong than in a centralized state. But these links should

exist in Europe if it is to be able to make progress in its development east, west, north, and south.

[PRAVDA] This is for President Mitterrand and President Gorbachev. What is the specific role, in your opinion, of the so-called Arab factor? And what is your position regarding the idea of convening an international conference on the Near East?

[Mitterrand] My position is universally known, because I put it forward. I have advanced this idea and even done so from the UN rostrum, not so long ago—at the end of September it was. The Italian journalist knows about everything in the world. Or do you want me to repeat to you what you already know full well.

[PRAVDA] I simply want to know whether you and President Gorbachev have undertaken anything which brings the convening of this conference any nearer?

[Mitterrand] We have indeed acted in that direction. Do not forget that I personally proposed an international conference on a general plane and did not want anything artificial. It is a mistake to try to unite people who do not want to unite. Afterwards, even if we do unite them, it will be necessary to have some kind of basis for an accord. And such has not existed to date. This needs to be taken very seriously. However, I spoke a long time ago now—about eight years ago—about an international conference on specific topics of Israeli-Arab relations. That is not the same thing, even if it looks identical outwardly. I want to repeat that I see enormous benefit in such conferences.

[Gorbachev] I want to add a couple of words. I think that if we believe in the political solution of acute conflicts—and I count myself among those politicians who do—we have to foresee that every search for political solutions is accompanied by analysis of the situation, by consideration of interests, and by certain assessments. This also includes a repetition of the descriptions and assessments given of Iraq's actions.

At the same time, however, this process is obviously considerably broader. It embraces many problems making up a very complex package, and it is best to get down to them all now. The process would be more realistic if it were to proceed within the framework of a pan-Arab conference, say, some kind of pan-Arab format, an Arab mechanism, since agreement could thus be reached more quickly. After all, all this is ultimately taking place on Arab soil. And it is necessary to put aside for the time being any noncoincidence of interests, sometimes even emotional issues, making paramount the need to settle this acute conflict, which could have the most grave consequences for both the Arabs and the world as a whole. The Iraqi leadership could agree to an Arab solution more quickly. Here individual countries could play a pretty serious role. And why among those countries—the idea comes to mind, occurs to me as I speak—should Saudi Arabia, which is next door to and has certain relations with Iraq, not put forward some kind of initiative? And others too.... Pan-Arab mechanisms do exist, after all, and they now need to

be set in motion. I spoke about this earlier and am now convinced on the basis of analysis and the information at my disposal that there now exist even greater arguments in favor of the Arab factor being used to resolve the situation.

[Mitterrand] I fully agree. I spoke about precisely this in my first speech to the press at the beginning of August. I think that any joint analysis by two countries which are permanent members of the Security Council could be useful. It could also prove useful in future debates. We proceed from the premise that the principles which have been established cannot be altered. And it is our basic duty to observe unity on the basis of those principles. And that means that we intend to continue the embargo as long as necessary. This does not, however, mean that we would not prefer peace. And we will spare no effort to ensure that peace reigns here and a peaceful solution be found. But the law has to be kept in mind here. Peace on the basis of law. And we have an interest in all states and diplomatic services enforcing respect for international law by peaceful means.

[PRAVDA] IAN: I would like through my question, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to shift discussion a little to domestic policy.

[Gorbachev] Then perhaps you should ask me the question in the Soviet Union?

[PRAVDA] ...It concerns your international activity. The point is that the topic of the "unpopularity" of the Soviet president's visits abroad is being raised in certain Western mass media today. Asking whether it is right for the president to be carrying out trips at this difficult, destructive time.

[Gorbachev] Right, I have to answer this. I am aware of such opinions held by representatives of certain political circles in the Soviet Union. I consider this to be speculation. Although it does reflect the political struggle and political processes which are now taking place in our country. But among our people and in the world community due credit is given to everything which has already been achieved in recent years as part of the implementation of the course of perestroika, new thinking, and improving international relations. All this is extremely necessary to everyone, after all. We say that we need to tackle problems in the Soviet Union, very difficult problems. We say that this is bound up to a considerable extent with the economy. All that is true. In order to gear the economy toward people, however, it is necessary to change a very great deal, not just in our domestic policy, but in our foreign policy, too. We can now state that we have embarked on a profound process of real disarmament and that partnership, cooperation, friendship, and trust rather than opposition and confrontation are becoming realities. And all this in turn has enormous significance within the country, for every Soviet person and Soviet family. All this is being undertaken on behalf of Soviet people themselves, for their benefit and peace of mind. The results of foreign policy make it possible for us in our domestic affairs to reach new understanding of military doctrine and the

structure of the Armed Forces, new understanding of the military sector of the economy, and to gear the economy more strongly toward meeting people's everyday needs. This constitutes a highly interconnected set of problems.

Everything that we are doing strengthens our conviction that both our country and its peoples enjoy greater security. And this is a common blessing without which people find it difficult to think and make plans. Remember what the main question Soviet journalists as well as Western journalists and ordinary people nearly always put until recently—will there be a war? Everyone was anxious, everyone said: Just let there be no war! But now that danger, a danger that really existed and was close to us, is no longer so. That, in itself, is a supreme blessing. Today no one asks me any more either inside my own country or abroad whether there will be war. They know for themselves that there will not be. Our country is organically returning to modern civilization and is ready to cooperate with everyone.

In short, I am convinced that we are pursuing a course which is consonant with the fundamental and most important interests of our people and the peoples of other countries. All speculation, wherever it hails from, is of no significance to me. I stand firm on the positions I have maintained and no one will dislodge me from them.

[PRAVDA] Mr. President, have you spoken about the situation in Lebanon; if yes, how do you intend to act, Mr. Gorbachev, to help that country? I address this question to both presidents.

[Mitterrand] The text adopted by the foreign ministers and which we naturally signed does talk of Lebanon—in order to remind people that that country has the right to independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. That, in turn, means that insofar as the agreement signed in al-Ta'if exists, it is essential that it be implemented fully, not unilaterally. There is envisaged a clearly defined timetable and the withdrawal of foreign troops now stationed in Lebanon. We, French, are at any rate taking action aimed at ensuring that the Lebanese become masters of their own fate.

[Gorbachev] The French and Soviet foreign ministers discussed this problem extensively and Mr. President has conveyed the essence of it. We have much in common in our approaches here. The president and I touched on this theme in the context of the situations arising in discussion of the problems of the Persian Gulf and the whole Near East situation. The Persian Gulf gives us yet another signal: The Near East can be left in its present state no longer. So there is an interconnection here. And forums are needed which will solve, of course, in the first instance and possibly without strict linkage the problem of Kuwait, restoring the international law violated by the aggressor, Iraq. But one cannot escape from the fact that a general situation exists which the events in the Persian Gulf have pointedly reminded us of and which will constantly produce dangerous incidents

and that the world community will constantly find itself faced with the unpredictable threat of a conflagration. There are no cogent arguments, particularly now, capable of convincing us that examination of these situations can be put off any longer. That is the context in which we are touching upon the questions here, mindful that there is a Palestinian problem and that the occupied Arab lands and Lebanon exist. All this awaits a solution. And it is precisely in this same context that we consider that Israel and the people of Israel must possess every reliable security guarantee.

[Mitterrand] I think you all appreciate that our news conference is drawing to a close. In conclusion I want to address Mr. Gorbachev and thank him for his assistance and for the role which he is playing in the international community and I want to say to him that I note with gratification that the stances of our two countries, particularly in this very complex sphere, coincide. We will continue to uphold the same aspirations and the same principles within the Security Council.

As far as France is concerned, I want to say a few concluding words. It has been reported to us that the French hostages are returning from Iraq. Every country conscious of its responsibility has expressed itself on this score in the Security Council. Other countries, too, also consider that first and foremost the problem of freeing the hostages figures among the basic conditions of any possible agreement. I mean the freeing of them all, without exception. We do not intend to let the fate of hostages be decided on grounds of nationality. We equally uphold the principle of freeing all hostages regardless of their nationality and origin. We will never accept that the actual concept of hostages can exist in a civilized world. I look forward very much to more than 300 French citizens returning, probably this evening. I express the joy of all French people on the return of those people from Iraq. The whole country will rise as one to give these people a cordial reception. Our joy will not be complete until all the remaining hostages return home. Some people will say that this is a very specific problem. No, it is a problem which affects the very essence of the freedom of man and human rights.

We are stopping here and I think that on this question the Soviet president and I have achieved full agreement. I think that this is very good augury for continuing talks at an international level and I hope for a peaceful settlement of the conflicts. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Returning to my present visit as a whole, I want to express satisfaction at its results. We have received hospitality and genuine interest here in everything that is happening in our country and the tasks which we are tackling. We have sensed deep understanding and a desire to help us overcome the difficulties facing us at this crucial stage of transformations. I want to thank the president for all this and wish success, happiness, and prosperity to every French family in this beautiful land. Thank you.

Supreme Soviet

Presidium Considers Upcoming People's Congress

LD0211134790 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov, met in the Kremlin today.

The Presidium considered preparations for the forthcoming 4th congress of USSR People's Deputies. It discussed and endorsed proposals on the convocation and the agenda, which will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Presidium set up a commission to organize practical work to prepare for the Congress, which includes representatives of all Union republics, committees of the Supreme Soviet and permanent commissions of the chambers, and groups of USSR people's deputies.

The deputy ethics code and the ordinance on the commission on deputy ethics were endorsed at the meeting. The Presidium also considered some other aspects of the work of the country's supreme legislature.

Supreme Soviet Resolution on Winter Preparations

PM0211152390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On the Readiness of the Country's Economy for Work in Winter Conditions'—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that the work of preparing economic sectors, the country's housing stock, and socioconsumer facilities for the winter cannot be deemed satisfactory.

The USSR Council of Ministers, ministries, and departments have reduced the level of their organizational work of supervising the activity of enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction to implement measures designed to ensure work in winter conditions. New power generation facilities are being introduced and existing capacities reconstructed, retrooled, and repaired on a considerably delayed basis. State orders for oil and coal extraction and deliveries of equipment and semi-manufactures to the fuel and energy complex and the municipal economy are not being fulfilled, railroad transport is failing to cope with fuel shipments, and there are major problems in preparing it for work in winter conditions.

The councils of ministers in the Union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies have not restructured their activity in accordance with the rights they have been accorded under the Law on Self-Management and have failed to display due exactingness toward those specifically responsible for preparing housing, cultural, public health, and public education

establishments, municipal transport, municipal utilities, and other local facilities for winter. Many regions of the country have not completed the repair and have failed to complete the construction of heating systems scheduled for commissioning, the requisite fuel stocks have not been created for sale to the population, and no steps are being taken to reduce consumption of fuel and energy resources. The work of bringing in the harvest and procuring potatoes, vegetables, and feed crops and the preparation of livestock premises and other agricultural facilities are considerably behind schedule.

In some republics the situation is aggravated by illegal actions to block transport communications and by interference from local organs of authority in the operational activity of enterprises in the fuel-extraction sectors and unified power and gas supply systems.

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. That the USSR Council of Ministers take cognizance of this issue.

That proposals and comments made by USSR Supreme Soviet committees, the chambers' permanent commissions, and USSR people's deputies in the course of discussion be submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers and republic organs in order that they might take urgent steps within the bounds of their competence.

2. That the USSR Council of Ministers take immediate steps to eliminate the permitted laggardness in fuel extraction and shipments, the commissioning and repair of power generation facilities, and in the delivery of equipment and semi-manufactures to enterprises within the fuel and energy complex and the municipal economy, and to implement a tough policy with regard to fuel and energy resource economy in all sectors of the national economy;

that, in conjunction with republic and local organs of state management, it examine within a month the possibility of commissioning finished power units at electric power stations, along with power generation facilities previously shut down in view of the steps being taken to reduce their environmental impact;

that it complete the formulation of the country's Energy Program this year and submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

3. To recommend that the supreme organs of state power and management in the Union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies consider the questions:

of enhancing the reliability of electricity and heat supply, above all for facilities within the social sphere and the municipal sector, in the possible extreme climatic conditions of the coming winter period;

of providing livestock complexes with feed, heat, and power and ensuring that they operate without interruption;

of taking steps to ensure the commissioning within the fourth quarter of 1990 of social infrastructure facilities scheduled for completion, particularly in Armenia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and other republics where there have been earthquakes and natural disasters;

of formulating proposals to improve the work of the country's housing and public utilities.

4. To recommend that the USSR president adopt the requisite decrees for the implementation of practical measures to ensure the stable working of the country's national economy during the 1990-1991 winter period and the effective utilization of energy and other resources.

The USSR Supreme Soviet urges supreme soviets in the Union and autonomous republics and people's deputies from soviets of all levels to do their utmost to help enhance the stability of economic enterprises and social facilities in winter conditions.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov
The Kremlin, Moscow, 30 October 1990

Political & Social

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Moldavia

LD0311212190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1840 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Interview with USSR Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov by correspondent Vadim Lobachenko in Moscow on 3 November; from the "In the USSR Government" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, the last few days have been clouded by particularly alarming news from Moldova [Moldavia], where, as we know, there have been human casualties. This arouses even more unease among all of the Soviet people. We have learned that there has been a meeting today between the leaders of the USSR and those of Moldova. What is your assessment of that meeting?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, the meeting with Moldovan President Snegur, as well as with Topal, representing the Gagauz population, and Comrade Smirnov, representing the Dnestr population, ended two hours ago. It was held at the office of the president of our country. The meeting was held at their request. Now as is known, the situation in Moldova has deteriorated very seriously in recent days, and there were clashes yesterday. For this reason there was a need for a meeting today to sort out what exactly is going on and what measures need to be taken to prevent such a situation from recurring.

The conclusion can be drawn that what has happened is the result of ill-considered actions on both sides. The roots, of course, go much deeper. These were issues that had gone unresolved for a long time, and so it was necessary to sit down at the negotiating table and find

solutions to them, rather than trying to resolve them by force of arms. It was therefore said today at the meeting that things cannot go on like that.

So what is the outcome of the meeting? Everyone is worried, naturally; everyone feels that further escalation simply cannot be allowed. For this reason everyone was of one mind that there must be unity in Moldova, and that Moldova must live as part of the Soviet Union. That was the main point of all.

Beyond that, to make it possible to resolve the issues calmly, it is essential that all the various formations set up during the past week in the republic be immediately disbanded, regardless of where they are, of which territory they are in, whether it be in the Kishinev area, or in the Dnestr region, or in the Gagauz areas—wherever they may be, they have to be immediately disbanded. That was the first matter discussed today, and a decision was made that steps should be taken at once to disband such formations, that people should return to their jobs, their educational establishments, or their homes, so that life might again run its normal course in the republic.

A no less important decision was adopted on the fact that it is necessary to declare a moratorium on all actions—a moratorium for both sides. All actions and all those decisions that have been made recently must be stopped to make it possible to calmly study all the issues. To do this we agreed to set up a special commission, a republican parliamentary commission, with representatives of the Gagauz population and representatives of the Dnestr population, who will have to sit down at the table and resolve these issues. These are the decisions adopted today at this meeting.

The firm opinion was expressed and corresponding instructions have been issued for an immediate investigation into yesterday's tragic event, which led to casualties. People must be punished, regardless of what public position they occupy, what post they occupy. This must be sorted out. Who set these peoples against one another? Who...

[Lobachenko, interrupting] Impunity from punishment leads to a new offense.

[Ryzhkov] This is impermissible. People must, those who incited the people to this must bear responsibility. Therefore, it was said today that while the republic carries out an investigation, at the same time investigators of our country's procurator general will be brought in to deal with all this.

I think, and this was mentioned during today's conversation—a difficult meeting, I would say—that in the final analysis it has nothing to do with the people. The responsibility for what is happening in Moldova lies on the shoulders of the leaders. We have declared that the country's leadership will follow the development of the situation in Moldova constantly and make decisions. If we see that the decisions being made locally are not going to be effective, we will have to take more resolute

measures. This was said today to the leaders of Moldova and the representatives of these populations.

[Lobachenko] I myself hail from Kishinev, and I have always said with pride that my home town is Kishinev. I am a Russian from Kishinev, and have always considered Kishinev a sunny city where there was friendship between Moldovans, Russians, and Ukrainians. One remembers one's childhood, one remembers the atmosphere of friendship between peoples.

[Ryzhkov] At today's meeting certain comrades, who arrived together with the leaders I have named, said that there was indeed never any question of such interethnic friction in Moldova, or in Kishinev in particular. People lived peaceably, lived normally. Well, in Kishinev itself, if I am not mistaken, half are Moldovans and approximately half are other peoples.

[Lobachenko] There were very many interethnic marriages.

[Ryzhkov] Yes. Interethnic marriages. Today, evidently, to the advantage of certain political ambitions, political aspirations, all this has gradually transferred to interethnic relations. This is the most frightening aspect. So here certain forces, which have been seeking this or that political solution, have ended up setting the peoples populating Moldavia against one another. This is inadmissible.

It is inadmissible for our country, for our multinational country. Even were this to happen only in Moldavia, or say in the Baltic region, or in any other of our regions, it is the most terrible thing our people could expect. It has to be stemmed at its roots. These processes must not be allowed to develop further. They must not.

[Lobachenko] We are meeting just before what is the main state festive occasion of all for us—the anniversary of the October Revolution. There now seem to be a lot of people around who have forgotten their roots—who say that the occasion does not need to be celebrated. The fact is, though, that it is a part of history, a part of our life. What is your view of such utterances, to the effect that the anniversary should not be marked?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, things are not easy for people today. However, as for those who call for an end to be put to celebrating the Great October Revolution, my feeling is that they do not reflect the views of the whole of our people. After all, most of the people, most people, view the celebrations on 7 November as a celebration of the formation of our state, the socialist state. I know that they do not intend to give up celebrating what is a great date for us. I would say that to decline to celebrate it is, moreover, to move to betray those people who laid down their lives for our state, in the revolution and in the Great Patriotic War. Those people who held a sacred belief in our state should never be betrayed. Never.

In the most difficult of times, the banner of the October Revolution has always sown hope in people, sown belief

in the original meaning of the socialist choice made by our country. This being the case, how can all that be removed and so simply deleted? Such things can be done only by political opportunists who really lack... [changes thought] who have no recollection of where they came from. They... [changes thought] in my view such people lack passion; they have empty souls, those who propose this. Indeed we have many sufferings, much distress in our past. But it would be absurd to claim that the decades have not left their mark on us. Our history is there to see, and what has been done by millions of our people must not be forgotten. One must always respect one's people, one's country; one must always respect one's history.

It goes without saying that an exceptionally difficult and painful process of cleansing is taking place now in the country, and I am deeply convinced that the country will come through this—that it will come out of it stronger, that it will come out renewed. So today more than ever we need civic accord. We need a true joining together of all forces to resolve the problems confronting us, so that the country might be renewed.

Permit me, therefore, esteemed and dear comrades, on behalf of the government, to proffer heartfelt congratulations to everyone for the coming festive occasion—the 73rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution—and to wish you all the best, all that is good, well-being and peace.

[Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, permit us, too—rather me, on behalf of our television crew—to congratulate you on the coming festive occasion, and to wish you health and success in your onerous work.

[Ryzhkov] Thank you. Thank you very much.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Address Students

PM0411182590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by TASS correspondents L. Shvedova, I. Novikov, B. Shestakov, and V. Shishlin: "Developing Higher Education to a New Level; Meeting Between USSR President and Students"]

[Text] As has already been reported in the press, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev met with representatives of Soviet students in the Kremlin 1 November. Taking part in the meeting were activists from student trade unions and other unsponsored organizations, a group of delegates from the All-Union Student Forum, members of the USSR Youth Organizations Committee's Student Council, and student members of self-administration organs from a number of major VUZ's [higher educational institutions] in various republics.

The meeting, which lasted several hours, was a development of the open and substantive dialogue between young students and the country's leaders which was begun at the All-Union Student Forum. The range of

issues discussed at the meeting was to a certain extent outlined in the appeal handed to the president by the meeting's participants and reflecting concern at higher education's current state of development. The students voiced ideas about using all existing means in order to bring the development of higher education to a new level, and addressed specific requests to the country's leadership. The discussion began with young student representatives from various cities and regions of the country being given an attentive hearing.

From the very first speeches the young people complained about USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 330. In particular, T. Volotkevich, a student from Krasnoyarsk, recalled that, under this document, loans are only made to students in their third year. But student families, she reasonably noted, may arise in the first and second years, particularly now that young men go to VUZ's after Army service. And how can a young student's family survive until the third year, particularly if they have a child?

V. Moshchenok, a student from Kharkov, also criticized this government resolution. It proposes that each VUZ set up a student social assistance fund... out of its own resources. In the Kharkov man's opinion this point should be reinforced with state finance, since there is nowhere for a student social assistance fund to take money from.

An important problem—VUZ property—was raised by the Leningrad student A. Obraztsov. Currently, he said, many VUZ's lease their teaching premises, sports facilities, and student halls of residence. Local organs of power set quite high rates of payment for the use of their land. Given that to all intents and purposes VUZ's have no funds of their own, they will be forced to give up their sports facilities, halls of residence, and even some of their teaching premises. The speaker proposed assigning to VUZ's the tracts of land, buildings, and installations which they use long-term.

Certain speeches raised the question of job assignments after graduation. Students are worried that the transition to market relations will create conditions in which unemployment will emerge. Young specialists need hard and fast guarantees. The student representatives believe that this is where state orders should come into play. They also proposed that VUZ's be exempt from tax and that tax breaks be given to enterprises which channel profits into developing education.

The legal status of students... Whereas workers' rights are currently protected by the Labor Law Code and other resolutions, students are virtually unprotected in this respect, I. Edilov from a Groznyy VUZ, noted. What can be done in this connection? This is clearly a question above all for the country's lawmakers.

Student problems were raised more broadly in the speech by K. Lebedinskiy (Leningrad). We should now be giving far greater thought to our future, he stressed. Education is the sphere in which the future and the shape

of our industry, science, politics, and the society of the future emerge. This, in the speaker's opinion, should be the starting point when determining the amount of attention and resources we devote to education. This sphere, he believes, needs new ideas and new approaches which would make it possible to achieve maximum results even with limited resources.

The speaker proposed elaborating a state program which would help to comprehensively develop young talents. In particular, as he put it, the resolution of this task would be promoted by the creation of a leading VUZ which could become a kind of "presidential college"—a vanguard educational establishment capable of integrating and cooperating on an equal basis with leading European and world centers of learning. And the speaker stressed that we need to keep higher education open to all. He advocated closer government-student cooperation in solving these problems, without resorting to the mechanism of hunger strikes and blockades.

The absence of an integrated and well-conceived program for the work of the government and the president vis-a-vis young people is leading to extraordinary situations, O. Chistenkova, editor of *STUDENCHESKIY MERIDIAN*, believes. In her words, students who go on hunger strike realize that they could be exploited by any political force and that the consequences of such manipulation could be terrible.

One other point to which the speaker drew attention—the lack of faith which, in her opinion, young people feel for any state youth structure. This, she said, is because contacts such as this meeting should be permanent fixtures rather than one-shot affairs.

Talking about the state of public catering enterprises at VUZ's, T. Datskiv (Lvov) noted the need to maintain the prices of foodstuffs for students during the transition to the market.

S. Baydukov (Moscow) agreed that it is nonetheless quite right to bring students' social and consumer problems to the fore. He is wholly and fully prepared to share K. Lebedinskiy's views, he stressed, but he would ask people not to forget that we have 9 million students and, clearly, they cannot all study in Soviet-Japanese universities. The most important thing, the speaker said, is to stabilize the student body's position during the transition to the market. Today's meeting, he is convinced, should mark the start of the road to a serious state program in this sphere. The speaker advocated the preparation of a corresponding presidential decree.

A number of the meeting's participants expressed concern about the trend toward a brain drain from our country to the West. In this connection one of the speakers noted that no country can afford to deal with its intellectual potential in the way that we do.

Specific proposals were mentioned for raising the prestige of higher education: the improvement of the quality of the teaching staff; the provision of a material interest

both for students to get an education, and for teachers; the creation of a material and technical base in line with the times, and so forth.

We are not setting ourselves in opposition to other population groups, V. Glukhov, chairman of the students union committee at the Far Eastern University, stressed. In his opinion, we need to end the practice of adopting disorienting resolutions that take no account of students' views.

The idea of setting up a contact structure to promote mutual understanding between the country's leadership and students was supported by S. Vlasenko (Lvov). He proposed utilizing other countries' experience in this respect. The speaker believed that a substantial role could be played by the All-Union Students Fund, the recently established information and analytical center under the USSR State Committee for Public Education, and an all-union students' newspaper. It is necessary, the speaker stressed, to fundamentally resolve the issue "connected with students' destructive role in society at the present stage." It is also necessary, he said, to arrange state targeted financing for student structures, "otherwise students will seek alternative sources."

Not only should state subsidies for education not be abolished, they should not be cut at all, I. Khalin (Tyumen) noted. In confirmation of these words he cited the potential of Tyumen State University, which has no funds to carry out major repairs. Many other participants in the meeting cited similar examples.

The problems of the youth movement were discussed by V.M. Zyukin, first secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee.

G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, recalled that we have inherited a difficult legacy—an incorrect youth policy. Young people in our country are struggling for their existence and take a long time to get themselves established, find housing, or obtain any benefits. We need to create the conditions for them to live on credit. At their most creative age young people should be supported by loans [kreditovana] from the state for a normal life. I realize that this will not be easy, the speaker added, but nonetheless the appropriate conditions for young people should be created.

The speaker also touched on the question of job placement. Mandatory guaranteed state placement resulted in people studying any old how because their degree certificate was more important than their knowledge. That is why we need to talk about ensuring that job placement caters as much as possible for students' needs.

Talking about the problem of state financing for public education, the speaker noted that the 6 percent of national income currently spent on education is not the norm. Developed foreign countries spend 10-12 percent of their total budget on education.

There is another norm in other countries too: Funds from state enterprises, cooperatives, or private individuals which are channeled into educational, health, or cultural development are wholly exempt from taxation. We tried to get this norm through parliament. It went through in this form of words, but with the following addition: to a total of no more than 1 percent of profits. And this 1 percent of profits makes the whole thing pointless.

V.I. Tsybukh, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Youth Affairs Committee, aligned himself with some of the previous speaker's conclusions, particularly as regards the need for major tax breaks for student loans [neobkhodimost seryeznogo nalogovogo lgotnogo kreditovaniya v otnoshenii studenchestva]. I can state, he noted, that this practice is being widely followed worldwide. During their civic formation young people should have the opportunity to take out a loan from the state. This may perhaps be inflationary to a certain extent. But it is better that the money go to students rather than into the pockets of the black economy, the speaker noted.

Talking about the practice of international student exchanges, he stated that the question of setting up an international youth cooperation fund, which will make it possible to implement cooperation programs very actively and on preferential terms, has now virtually been resolved. The speaker voiced the need for a presidential decree to be adopted on priority measures to implement state youth policy.

Recalling that the 19th Soviet Trade Union Congress had adopted a resolution on youth policy, V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the General Confederation of USSR Trade Unions, noted that students now see the solution to many problems not only in getting help from the state but also in earning funds themselves and organizing enterprises themselves, whose profits would really be used to satisfy students' needs. Students need our help in this direction, and I believe, the speaker said, that the discussions which have long been held about setting up a special student fund should be implemented.

The trade union leader touched on another problem—student health. This is a vital problem, and even grant increases do not always result in students eating better. The speaker proposed envisaging a system of preferential catering for students. The Social Welfare Fund should be channeled into improving the health of the entire population—and primarily of students, of course. The USSR Law on Trade Union Rights, which is under examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet, should envisage a situation in which trade union student organizations should be legally protected.

Life itself has raised the problem of the serious acquisition of knowledge, V.N. Belyayev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Public Education and Upbringing, noted. How can we ensure that completing one's studies at a VUZ guarantees people a good job rather than using the old methods of job allocation,

when we were forced to send graduates to places they did not want to go? Our educational system should be equal to world standards, the parliamentarian said. We should not forget that the market is coming, and people will have to adapt to market economy conditions.

The speaker criticized the ingrained notion that educational issues are part of the social sphere. No, he said, they relate to the sphere of material production. And that is the most important sphere. The speaker backed up this idea with the following example: 50 percent of the resources spent on health are spent as a result of the damage done to the younger generation during the educational process—from kindergartens to graduation from an institute.

The need for party committees to step up their attention to the student sphere was mentioned by A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He recalled that back at the 28th CPSU Congress particular attention was devoted to young people. This was followed by other decisions—particularly at the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum, when students were included among other population groups requiring particular social protection during the transition to the market economy. As a political party, we will be striving to firmly and consistently implement this line, the speaker stressed.

In their speeches the students expressed the fear that the adoption of the law on entry to and exit from the country would intensify the "brain drain" from our country. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee voiced the idea that it is necessary to adopt a number of special measures to create conditions which would rule out such an undesirable turn of events. He vigorously supported the students' proposal for a permanent structure to link students with the head of state and government. The party leader agreed that students should have their own press organ.

A.A. Logunov, rector of Moscow State University, expressed concern at the fact that our higher education is currently uncompetitive with leading, and not only leading, foreign countries. In order to close this gap we need, in his opinion, to create particularly favorable conditions for educational establishments with a major scientific potential.

Then the students took the floor again. One of them—S. Yelagin, a representative of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University—made the following appeal to the president: Visit our university, do not forget your alma mater! I accept that comment, M.S. Gorbachev replied.

He proposed that mass media leaders involved in the coverage of youth topics should speak out on the problems under discussion.

Yu.A. Rostovtsev, chief editor of the journal *STU-DENCHESKIY MERIDIAN*; G.N. Seleznev, chief

editor of *UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA*; and V.A. Frolin, chief editor of *KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA*, shared their views.

The latter, in particular, said that it is important for students themselves to discuss student problems in full measure in the newspaper. We see today's meeting, he stressed, as rebutting the prevailing opinion that students are isolated in society. Students, the speaker said, can only solve problems along with the rest of the country, hence their attention to the political processes taking place in society. The speaker compared the current situation to a choppy sea in the process of purification, noting that he sees the newspaper's task as being to save the young generation from the path of confrontation and violence. This is important now that different opinions—not least student opinions—may clash on the eve of a military parade to mark a holiday.

When we discussed the question of holidays at the Supreme Soviet, M.S. Gorbachev said in response to this, we received 20,000 telegrams in the space of two days. And they asked: Who is attacking our history and revolution? How can we abandon all that? You have spoke out against a monopoly on the truth. But don't you think that you now have your own kind of monopoly? There is no sense of pluralism in *KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA*. You put forward a single view, while there is a diversity of views in society. How is this diversity reflected in your newspaper? Young people should know about the real processes.

Or, for instance, take a recent case on central TV. The basic guidelines for the transition to the market were discussed by 22 committees. With certain questions, nuances, and clarifications we could see that a huge amount of work had been done to synthesize all these ideas. Everyone supported the main principles. But the television covered three critical speeches, three voices against. Tell me, does this standpoint represent objective coverage? No, it is disinformation and a distortion of the facts. It is impermissible that, while bidding farewell to one monopoly, we should embark on another, the president stressed.

Government and students—that is how one can describe the theme of N.I. Ryzhkov's speech. The processes taking place among students are the same as in society. We should keep this in mind when formulating our policy, he said. While dealing with the concerns of today, we must think about the state's long-term development and its future, paying primary attention to young students, since it is they who will shape our country's future.

The government has always been attentive to the problems of education. Young people's alarm with regard to the coming of the market is understandable—after all, students are the least protected section of society. So, how should we live under the market? In the opinion of the head of the government, existing programs are still not in line with the principles we will have to work with in the future. For instance, our country is still forced to

send lots of specialists abroad for retraining. Yet another such agreement was signed during the president's recent visit to France.

The premier is concerned about the fact that the cultural and moral stratum of our society, without which the country cannot move forward, has changed over the decades. The student environment is the most fruitful field for shaping this stratum, he noted, and he expressed the conviction that we will not achieve the tasks we are setting ourselves if we have marvelous specialists who are uncultured and amoral people.

As for social issues, N.I. Ryzhkov described everything that was said in that area as a "cri de coeur." We need a real action program, he said. Above all, we need to balance the market and avoid any sharp inflationary spirals. Following the student forum we have done a very great deal of work on these issues and we have made considerable progress. However, one would not like the resolution which was worked out along with the students with some difficulty should acquire the appellation "notorious."

Let us think together, the premier proposed. Judging by everything, we will have to proceed in several areas. The first, of course, is state support and state financing. Here too we need to clearly realize that there are two budgets—the central budget and the republic budget. There is a law dividing functions between the center and the republics, and consequently the task is to seek the greatest level of financing from the state and from republic budgets.

N.I. Ryzhkov stressed that it is necessary to deal very seriously with the student economy. For instance, I agree to allow the normal permissible privileges in order to let students earn some money, and this is particularly important during the formation of a market economy, he said. First and foremost, we must protect needy sectors, students, and pensioners. The government is working on a system of compensation. We need to draw the appropriate conclusions from today's constructive discussion, which I have enjoyed very much. I think I will take the appeal made by the meeting participants as the basis for my future work. I propose to examine all proposals during November in order to do everything possible. If something is impossible, I will honestly say so.

The premier pointed out another factor—the importance of student representatives' taking part in solving these problems. The government would clearly make fewer mistakes, Nikolay Ivanovich noted, if it met more frequently with young people. He proposed considering a mechanism for regular meetings. It seems to me that permanent contact is particularly necessary now, during the transition to the market, which will require some serious work, he stated.

Talking about today's article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, N.I. Ryzhkov said: As for me, quite honestly I never expected anything else from that newspaper. But

why this disdain for the young people meeting today for a discussion with the country's leaders?

Following the head of government's speech the floor was taken by the student O. Namazanova (Moscow), who made some proposals in the light of what he had said. It is very important, she believes, to include in the final document of the meeting a provision on instituting most-favored status for the development and activity of all student structures prepared to undertake the resolution of certain student problems. She expressed the hope that the Council of Ministers would accelerate the process of examining the documents presented to it for the registration of existing student formations.

I think that the way in which the government and the head of state have been talking with us today should be an example for many leaders—from republics to VUZ's—V. Musayev (Dushanbe) said. You have not lectured us but have been very receptive right from the start and heard us out. We would ask that our problems not go unnoticed in the future either.

Before the president took the floor to sum up the results of the meeting he was handed an appeal from the students of Lvov asking him to help Aleksey Shevchenko, a student at Lvov Polytechnical Institute. A victim of the Chernobyl disaster with acute leukosis, his life can only be saved by a complete bone marrow transplant—which will require foreign currency (\$100,000). The president promised to help.

M.S. Gorbachev then summed up the results of the discussion.

I welcome this dialogue, the president said, particularly because it is continuing our meetings and becoming a tradition. We probably need to set up some kind of cooperation mechanism which would allow us to maintain contact on a regular basis. This will make it possible to provide information more quickly on what is happening in the student sphere and what is of concern to students. Conversely, students should also be aware of the leadership's views.

Perhaps it would be worth setting up such a structure under the president—let's think about it. Or under the Supreme Soviet, under the government? In general, I am in favor of implementing the idea you have expressed here. We need structures that make it possible to realize the energy, ideas, and initiative of young students, helping them to find themselves, and, above all, to feel involved with our great work and, at the same time, to resolve matters directly relating to student life. And student life, as is well known, is a special time.

Society cannot lose sight of young students who are entering life, bringing with them culture and knowledge of various sectors of the national economy—without which there can be no social progress. In short, let us not delay the formation of such a council, and if we create it under the president we will formulate it by decree.

Now to turn to your appeal. In general, I agree with Nikolay Ivanovich. I too see no empty or demagogic provisions, a great deal in it derives from life. This appeal deserves attention, and it would perhaps be worthwhile setting up an initiative group from among the meeting's participants specifically with this in mind. Since there are various issues here relating to legislative and executive activity and pertaining to other structures, let us examine them specifically—issue by issue. We are currently discussing the plan and budget, many things can be taken into account. Moreover, specific measures are being elaborated to implement the basic guidelines for the transition to the market, including all these points—not least questions of people's social protection.

I am convinced that a society can be judged by the position of women, the family, young people, and veterans in it. As for young people, at all stages they have always been active participants in the country's development: They have developed science and given their young lives in defending the country. Analyzing our history and revealing all its deformations, drama, and tragedy—which resulted in great losses for the people, society, and for many individuals—I cannot (my tongue would simply not be able to utter such things) talk about the meaninglessness of the generations who came through all this and gave us what we have today.

The ground under our feet is firm, it is not shifting or slippery. There is a huge base in our society, and we need only to get new springs working in order to bring this potential into play. It is indeed huge—both in terms of intellectual potential and even in terms of scientific and technical potential, despite our lags and the aging of our capital. There is great potential in our resources of space and of people. This society could be one of the most dynamic, and our state one of the most prosperous.

All this does not prevent us from seeing the full acuteness of the current situation, the socioeconomic and political instability that result sometimes in even chaotic phenomena, and the painful processes of transforming a multinational state. I think that in such a society as ours and after everything that we have experienced there is no chance of resolving everything just like that, at a stroke, even if we desperately want to. We would be pushing society to fit into some kind of idealistic and tempting scenario instead of facing up to life, building up our knowledge, culture, and experience, and enriching ourselves. The correct process would be to achieve new forms of life consonant with our socialist ideals and the principles of justice and democracy.

We should not chase after the good life: We remember collectivization. We need to create the legal and economic prerequisites to enable people to understand matters, determine where they stand, and choose their own position. Only then will this process proceed rapidly and produce results. And, conversely, if we break people at this initial stage, we will be doing immense harm to society and, ultimately, we will not obtain what is necessary. The phrase "socialism is the living creativity

of the masses" seems simple, but it is the answer to all our shortcomings and a lesson for the future. We should all create the new forms of life together, and do so by heeding one another and not giving in to alternative proposals and political movements which may not agree with our ideas. We need to cooperate if we want to transform the country in the interests of all of us. We need to harmonize our relations and, above all, give people economic, political, and spiritual freedom. Then everyone will gain.

Of course, this is not something outside of time and space, it is not something ideally pure, everything must be mixed together, formulated, and elaborated in some kind of mechanism and form of this life. But we must get through this period, because nothing will be achieved hurriedly. That is why I want to say this to you representatives of our young people. I have already met with many of you. I heard the ideas at the students' forum and the Komsomol Congress and was profoundly convinced that our young people are becoming a very thoughtful section of society. It is not just a question of energy or a desire to reshape things—these qualities have, naturally, always been there. Every generation makes its own contribution. If this were not so and if we deprived young people and the generations entering life of their right to really make their own contribution, life would come to halt. Every generation grasps what it inherits from previous generations and unfailingly makes its own contribution. These, perhaps, are somewhat emotional arguments, but they are needed to get at the main point.

The current situation is such that we are now in the decisive phase. We are now experiencing perhaps the most crucial period in Soviet history. The next few months and years will determine what will become of us. In the next few months we should experience the period of entering the market. This transitional period will last around one and a half years, and a great deal should have happened by next fall. And our society's experience will be determined for dozens of years and even centuries ahead by the way in which this happens and the way we behave during these months.

It is said that at these stages people long for the authoritarianism which we have rejected. Authoritarianism is the wrong word, we rejected a totalitarian regime. People are asking if, when we encounter difficulties and the need for both political and economic stabilization, we will not gravitate toward the old methods, so to speak. No, comrades. If you look at the similar stages in the history of any state moving from one condition to another—and you have no doubt done so—then I have to tell you that at such times there is a special need for stability. Today we are taking the route of profound transformations which together we have worked out and determined with difficulty. And this is a progressive, not a reactionary, policy. It is a policy whose implementation will result in this society—both the economy and the political institutions—being geared to people. In general, the central idea is individual freedom and interests as the starting point. If we agree on that main point—and we

do—then, in order to maintain this policy, we need to move toward new forms. But we must do so in such a way as to keep control of the situation, to prevent it from blowing up or taking on chaotic forms, and to ensure that destabilization does not reach dangerous levels. And this danger is already upon us, both in the economy and as regards legality and the multinational state. We must not retreat any further. That way lies the collapse of the economy, the state, and political structures. That is why we must resort to some measures of a strict political or administrative nature but based, naturally, on the law.

This is necessary so as to ensure that we do not lose our grip on policy or find ourselves facing the need to halt the entire process and introduce something akin to a dictatorship. That would be a huge loss, it would be a simply unforgivable historical digression, and it would set us back a number of years if we missed out on our current opportunities. That is what we must realize. Anyone who wants to exploit the elements of instability in the economy, politics, and society as a whole in order to besmirch perestroika and attempt to turn us back has to be stopped. This must not be permitted. Just as we should not make a fuss of or suspect those who have accepted perestroika and are actively participating in it, so should we not ignore those who as yet do not quite grasp the meaning of the transformations that are taking place.

We now need consolidation. Our aims have been defined in all areas: both as regards the economy and property relations, and as regards the political process and the reform of our multinational state. That is why we will now do everything to promote these processes. Very major measures lie ahead: We will have to curb income growth and restore the balance between the money supply and the supply of goods. The market needs to get back to normal. Because if there is no market stability, if shortages increase, and if speculative trading emerges, money will lose its value many times over, and no compensation will rescue that process. That is why we need to take the situation strictly in hand and adopt a range of stabilization measures which will affect not only the money supply, finances, the budget, and so forth. We should even perhaps keep in reserve the option of introducing even stricter measures if the outlined plan does not work and if we are unable to stabilize the situation.

But the situation must be taken in hand in the space of a few months in order to make it possible to resolve positive tasks normally and to promote new forms of economic and political life within a framework of balance. The most important thing now is to consolidate and understand each other. And in this connection I have very great hopes of our young people, because this is your time, your life, and, much more so, the life of all future generations.

We should not leave here today without having understood each other. The period we have entered presents immense and historic opportunities, but great dangers as

well. We must grasp these opportunities and guard against irreparable mistakes. Such mistakes will only happen if we fail to understand each other.

Now to state policy in the sphere of public education. I consider that everything you have said here wholly coincides with my own view.

I want to support the idea that, when resolving individual issues, we should not forget about the main thing that we should create in our society. I think that this will give impetus to the movement toward the market and the restructuring of our economy. We need a system of powerful incentives for intellectual work. Currently we do not really value such work. This system should offer clear incentives for people's talent, instead we are engaged in a process of erosion. Everyone gets top marks, but why should they? Or all engineering and technical workers get a 15-percent pay rise, but why all of them? Why doesn't it apply to people's work, their achievements, or the things that people propose or that a group comes together to bring about? That is the problem.

I believe that we have taken the first very important step: Following a proposal from a group of academicians we have handed over to the Academy of Sciences everything that it has at present to enable it to own it and deal with it. We have granted it enormous autonomous rights to enable it to resolve issues of providing incentives, particularly for young and rising cadres. The Academy must construct a real program based on interest rather than an administrative program, and create the conditions in which everyone can realize their scientific potential. Now I must say that they have already succeeded in doing a great deal. Literally two months after the decree on the USSR Academy of Sciences the situation has started to change considerably for the better. And that is gratifying.

Similarly we must place a high value on engineering, but real engineers rather than just paper-pushers, that would be nonsensical. We should indeed value engineering more than we have hitherto, and in this respect processes are already underway—the situation has changed very markedly in sectorial science. To such an extent that there have already been distortions in the other direction—attempts, to so speak, to raise pay irrespective of contribution.

That is why your way of framing the question of state policy in the sphere of education coincides with our understanding. Indeed, this is a very effective contribution, and we will accomplish nothing, we will fail to achieve the goals toward which our perestroika and our peaceful revolution are geared, if we fail to really promote this sphere with a corresponding state policy.

We will now do everything that our current potential allows. So I believe that the question of 10 percent was rightly raised, and we will have to look at that. We cannot do so as yet, but we need to be honest. In the future, I believe that this will simply be a necessity.

You are probably aware that, following the student forum, we all divided up and adopted all the resolutions relating to the Politburo—that is, the political resolutions. There were government resolutions on issues relating to the government. A number of other organizations, including the State Committee for Public Education, examined their own issues. I was informed before this meeting that a great deal is moving in the necessary direction. Some things may not suit you, others may not suit us, but there has been progress.

People have also mentioned the state program for the development of higher education that is being elaborated on the president's instructions. After meeting with the students we had another very acute discussion with rectors of the country's educational establishments. And now Comrade Yagodin is drawing up this program along with republic education committees. I think that it will be a good thing if young student representatives were to become involved in this work right now. They should think about what is being outlined in the program. So I think that we will be able to reach our desired goals through joint efforts.

The need for a decree has been mentioned here. Let us clarify that. There is a law on youth policy, but if another decree is needed, it should be definite and specific. If you have a plan, give it to me to examine, and we will see.

To continue. The transition to the market and students' living conditions. Right now we are considering mechanisms, and it is good that you are too. Nikolay Ivanovich has essentially answered this point. The mechanisms should include indexation and a tax policy which would allow you to have your own opportunities to resolve and satisfy your needs and to have your own income. I think that we need a different tax policy, we need to go back to the idea of loans again and look at the system of subsidies. Some things will be kept, others not. All this will have to be looked at. And I think that the group which will be set up here should work on this matter and formulate its approaches. I even think that the leaders of the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the trade unions should be instructed to jointly elaborate these mechanisms and submit them to the government.

We should also find a way to implement the desire to ensure that construction of VUZ projects receives priority. If we recognize the priority development of this entire sphere—without which we cannot expect any long-term success for society or hope that it will achieve a new quality—how can we achieve this development without construction and material and technical provision? In this connection I support the idea raised here of creating special standard-setting colleges or groups. I think that we should return to what we discussed around three years ago and for some reason then shelved. We should nonetheless spotlight 20-30 major scientific centers, where the schools are strongest, where returns are highest, and where the influence on all of science is at its greatest. And, given our limited opportunities, we should select the best kids from there—there may be many

wanting to join them, but we will have selection criteria. But this does not mean that we will not be concerned about all VUZ's.

Representation in organs of power. You have already started appearing in them, and that is a good thing. Young people have begun to appear in the new party Central Committee, and probably at the next plenum we should bring some young Communists into the Central Committee Secretariat. I think that when we are clear about the distribution of power between the republics and the center we should simultaneously resolve this issue by introducing really new blood into state organs. I welcome this: New tasks should not be resolved using old approaches alone without making use of more and more new blood. And, I believe, one of the good things about perestroika is that it has already created definite forms, legal prerequisites, and a breeding ground in society for the inclusion of new blood in all processes both in the economy and in politics.

The changes are proceeding with difficulty, but when has anything ever gone smoothly? Things are never easy if we are tackling serious matters. Our tasks require immense general effort and, of course, the massive introduction of creative young forces into all the organisms of our society, which is in the process of renewal.

On holidays. This problem has been discussed by the Presidential Council, the government, and the USSR Supreme Soviet. We resolutely advocate maintaining the traditions which emerged in this country following the revolution. One of these traditions is to celebrate the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. For us this represents not just a past event or a revolution of long ago, but a global event for our country and the entire world. It was a revolution which produced powerful impulses that have not died down among our people, despite all the difficulties and trials which have fallen to our lot. Even now these impulses inform people's actions and their position. We should all think just why different kinds of objections are suddenly surfacing now that we have decided to get back to original ideas and meanings—to October, so to speak, whose banners proclaimed the need above all to overcome people's alienation from power, from the means of production, from property, and from culture. Why does this not suit us now? If we have raised issues of social justice and democracy, does this mean that the original meaning has been lost? No, on the contrary. Yes, we are opposed to barracks-style socialism, total state ownership, and totalitarian political regimes that suppress people's freedoms, ignore the individual, and turn people into cogs in some subordinate machine. But, after all, the October Revolution was accomplished with these slogans about democracy and justice. And if we are getting back to that, it does not mean that we are betraying the cause begun by the revolution. On the contrary, we want to revive it. But some people, in my opinion, want to divert us from this path and move us in another direction. I think that our society nonetheless intends to implement all the transformations within the framework of the socialist

choice. Our goal is a truly creative conception of socialism taking account of our own experience, the experience of civilization, and the current opportunities afforded by our society.

That is why I personally see this holiday—both in terms of my own state responsibility and as an ordinary citizen of this country—as the most important holiday. Where were those who are trying to cast aspersions on it—and by using trivial arguments such as “let’s wash the windows” or “let’s get ready for winter”—when we needed to bring in the harvest that was lying in the fields? Back then there was commotion and uproar in the squares, but now, see, they are calling for the holiday to be dropped and not celebrated. There is something strange and suspicious about this, I have major doubts about the arguments being put to us. They simply want to turn us around and divorce us from our traditions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted a resolution on this score. The Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, having examined the procedure for the staging of the holiday, have spoken out against parallel antistate, anti-Soviet demonstrations being held on that day. And I believe that this view reflects our people’s interests. At least the interests of the vast majority of them.

If some people want to propagandize their position or take to the streets, let them demonstrate at some other time. The desire to demonstrate during the holiday so as to provoke a conflict forces us to think yet again about the aims that the organizers of these actions are following. I think that this does not benefit the idea of consolidation. That is why I want to say quite definitely before you that we are in favor of holidays and that holidays will continue. Do all our people want this? I told you at the beginning that the Supreme Soviet had hardly started discussing this issue when it received 20,000 telegrams in the space of two days demanding that it adopt a resolute position and say “No” to those who are trying to drag us into such things. I think that this would be tantamount to disavowing ourselves and the values that make up our new culture and our memories. And our people are making very fair demands of state organs. This was shown by the tremendous response in our society following the adoption of the presidential decree on the holding of military parades in connection with the coming October Revolution anniversary.

We have no hesitation or doubt that this is the right cause and a sacred tradition which should be preserved and followed.

During our discussion the following words of W. Churchill were mentioned during the interval: “The difference between a statesman and a politician is that the politician looks to the next elections, while the statesman looks to the next generation.” In this instance I agree with him.

I would like us to part on a note of mutual understanding.

I congratulate all of you on the coming holiday.

I would ask you to think about the structures we have agreed on here so that we can move matters ahead.

Federation Council Discusses Union Treaty

*LD0211200290 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT
2 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—A meeting of the USSR Council of the Federation was held under the chair of President Mikhail Gorbachev today.

The meeting discussed the concept of a new Union treaty. During the discussion, its members expressed opinions on political and economic issues.

These issues include principles which should underlie the revitalisation of the Soviet multinational state, the greater content of the sovereignty of republics, the clear-cut division between the functions of Union and republican bodies, the creation of political and legal conditions for all the peoples to implement their right to self-determination and self-government and to use the advantages of development under the Union treaty.

Despite various assessments and approaches, council members expressed general interest in preserving and revitalising the Soviet Union.

They pointed to the need to accelerate the drafting of a new Union treaty in the interests of political and economic stabilisation and stronger public law and order to create favourable conditions to switch to market relations and to speed up perestroika.

Speakers noted that disagreement in actions of authorities at various levels hampers the solution of social and economic tasks, increases tension in society and complicates cooperation with foreign countries.

In these conditions, the restructuring of the Union on a new contractual basis is a vital issue for the entire country and the future of its peoples.

The meeting decided that the ideas of republics would be taken into account in finalising a Union treaty which will be then submitted for the consideration of the Soviet parliament and the parliaments of republics.

The council also discussed how to ensure the coordination of republics’ activities for the period before a new Union treaty is concluded.

The need for this coordination is prompted by the necessity to carry out concerted measures to implement “the guidelines to stabilise the national economy and to switch to market relations” adopted by the Soviet parliament, as well as the need to strengthen legality, law and order and discipline.

Gorbachev stressed that strict observance of the USSR Constitution by executive and legislative bodies at all

levels, mass organisations and Soviet citizens is assuming paramount importance in the present situation.

The establishment of an inter-republican committee on economic reform and the hard currency committee will promote greater coordination of actions by republics. It is planned to publish relevant presidential decrees in the near future.

Council members also discussed the economic and political situation in the country.

Presidential Council Personnel Changes Reported

*LD0311164190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the USSR president, has issued a decree releasing Chingiz Aytmatov from his duties as a member of the USSR Presidential Council in connection with his appointment as the Soviet Union's extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador to Luxembourg.

We have also received a decree of the USSR president in accordance with which Nikolay Nikolayevich Gubenko has been appointed a member of the Presidential Council.

Moscow Approves National Day Parallel Rallies

*LD0211140990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1147 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Bersenev]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—The Executive Committee of Moscow City Council made a final decision at its sitting on Thursday [1 November] afternoon on the question of demonstrations in Moscow on the anniversary of the October Revolution. It was discussed, taking into account the recommendations of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decision on parallel demonstrations and rallies in the city on 7 November.

Evaluating the situation which has arisen in the capital, and having listened to representatives of party and public organizations who came forward with initiatives for holding demonstrations, the Moscow City Council Executive Committee decided to maintain all the requests so as not to arouse political passions around this significant date, and to guarantee all citizens equal rights in expressing their views which are not in conflict with the law.

And so three demonstrations are proposed: One will be held on Red Square by the City Party Committee, the City Komsomol Committee, and organizations working together with them; the second—by the Moscow Association of the Electorate; and the third—by a group of USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies.

During the discussion there was again talk of not holding any demonstrations on this day at all. In this case the Moscow Association of the Electorate announced its readiness to withdraw its request. But a representative of the organizational committee for preparing the celebrations for the anniversary of the October Revolution, the first organization to submit such a request, did not agree with this, stressing its intention to hold a demonstration by the capital's working people.

In its decision the Executive Committee recommends limiting each of the demonstrations to no more than 25,000 people. The Moscow Association of the Electorate has chosen a route which does not intersect with the other demonstrations.

Council for International Fronts Established

*LD0311155990 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT
3 Nov 90*

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow November 3 TASS—Numerous movements existing in the Soviet Union, which campaign for the preservation of the political and economic integrity of the country and for the respectful attitude to the rights of national minorities, which are also known as international fronts, have created a single steering body. A decision to this effect was taken at the scientific and practical conference "International Movements: State and Prospects," which ended here today. The conference was attended by representatives from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia, the Western Ukraine and Central Asian Republics, as well as USSR people's deputies from the Soyuz (Union) Group.

Many speakers at the conference expressed concern over the growth of anti-Russian feelings in republics and the whipping up of inter-ethnic and political tension. The Supreme Soviet, the president and the prime minister were often criticised at the conference. Many members of the international fronts believe that their stand on these problems is unclear.

It was pointed out at the conference that the international fronts should act together and not in isolation, as before. This is the purpose of the creation of the Central Coordination Council, one of its organisers told journalists today. The Coordinating Council will not have a single president, but co-chairmen. Participants in the conference, aware of the need for taking urgent action, agreed that it is not expedient to hold an all-Union congress of international fronts now.

Government Urges Observance for Union Laws

*LD0311203490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1753 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—Major questions related to the allocation of powers in the spheres of legislation and administration must be decided during the conclusion of a new union treaty. However, until this treaty is

concluded, all organizations, officials, and citizens are obliged to rigorously observe the clauses in the current USSR Constitution, in the laws adopted in conjunction with it, in the decrees of the USSR president, and in other acts of the higher bodies of state power and administration of the USSR. This was noted at a session of the USSR Council of Ministers presidium here today. The presidium returned to these problems in connection with the fact that the lack of correspondence between union and republican legislation drastically complicates the process of setting plans and budgets at all levels, and may lead to a complete disorganization of economic links, of the interaction between enterprises and bank and financial bodies, and to a further fall in production and a lowering of the population's standard of living.

The USSR Government expresses confidence that its decision will help to prevent the development of destructive processes in society, and will facilitate stabilization of the economy and a very fast extrication of the country from its crisis.

Interethnic Front Denounces Gorbachev

LD0311233490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1545 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkovich]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—Representatives of the union republic interethnic fronts [Interfrontov] announced the setting up of a central coordinating council of USSR interethnic movements at a press conference that took place today in the capital's Kuntsevskiy CPSU rayon committee. In this way the country's interethnic movements have united in a single organization that declares itself to be an adherent to "equal rights for all inhabitants of the union republics, regardless of their ethnicity and the duration of their stay in this or that territory".

While asserting that they are supporters of a socialist choice, the interethnic front members see the future of the union in a federation of equal union republics. However, immediately they have come out against what they call the "conniving" policy of M.S. Gorbachev which, as they express it, "sanctioned civil war in Moldova to the advantage of world imperialism."

Professor V. Yakovlev, doctor of juridical sciences and a leader of the Moldovan interethnic movement, whom the republican parliament recently stripped of his deputy's mandate, in his words, "for dissidence and support for the creation of the Gagauz and Dnestr republics," has stated that the "main mistake" of the USSR president with regard to Moldova is the demand to observe two "completely different" sets of legislation: the "bearable" union one and the "fascist-people's front"—to borrow the expression of the ex-deputy—republican one.

However, the statements by Professor V. Yakovlev looked moderate against the background of the frankly inflammatory replies of his interethnic front colleagues,

calling for neither more nor less than physical reprisal against M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin.

The CPSU also "got it in the neck." Members of the coordinating committee accused the general secretary, the Politburo, the CPSU Central Committee, and the leadership of certain republican party committees of "opportunism and apostasy." By way of example, an interethnic front member from Kazakhstan mentioned the fact of the advent, in his words, "in the depths" of the republican Communist Party Central Committee of the declaration on state sovereignty of the Kazakhstan SSR, distinguished, as he thinks, by "frankly nationalist premises".

In response to your TASS correspondent's question on plans for the setting up of interethnic front armed units, I. Lopatin, Latvian interethnic front representative, confirmed that such units are already being set up. They are to oppose, as he expressed it, the "people's front guerrillas" and are called interethnic brigades. However, I. Lopatin said, "they have no arms." Nonetheless, the interethnic front member does not exclude the possibility of arming his confederates for, according to his belief, power in a number of republics has switched to "fascists from the people's fronts," and the officials of the law enforcement bodies subordinate to the local bodies of authority are mainly working for them. Therefore, I. Lopatin believes, V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, should "immediately be retired," and in his place "a strongman should be appointed."

CPSU's Financial 'Complications' Revealed

PM0411140990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Nov 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "At the CPSU Central Control Commission": "CPSU Budget in 1990"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Control Commission has heard a report from the CPSU Central Committee Administration of Affairs on the fulfillment of the party budget in the first half of this year.

During this period the CPSU budget received income equivalent to 48.9 percent of the total planned for the year, and experienced outflows of 43.8 percent of the annual figure. Compared with the same period last year, revenue from all sources fell by 55 million rubles [R]. The falling trend on the income side of the budget has not been rectified in the subsequent months of this year.

The reasons for the complications in the party's financial position have been revealed. The main reason is the sharp decline in discipline, and the slackening of the attention paid by party organizations and committees to ensuring prompt and full payment of membership subscriptions. Certain party organizations are setting subscription rates willfully, and are being arbitrary in their expenditure. Statutory requirements pertaining to subscriptions are being blatantly violated in Arkhangelsk,

Bryansk, Ryazan, Tyumen, and Sakhalin oblast organizations and other organizations. Contrary to CPSU Statutes party organizations at a number of mines in the town of Inta, Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], have been setting subscriptions at 1 percent, and this amount is not payable on Communists' total income. Underpayment of subscriptions to the tune of R275,000 has been uncovered in the primary party organizations of 28 RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] oblasts, krais, and autonomous republics alone. A reduction has also been noted in receipts derived from a proportion of the profit from publishing activity that is channeled into the budget.

Approximately 90 percent of appropriations from the CPSU budget are currently channeled into financing the activities and developing the material base of local party organs and primary party organizations. That is why the drop in income reduces the potential for financing party committees and institutions, and their organizational and mass political work. Consequently, the party's working conditions in labor collectives are deteriorating.

The CPSU Central Control Commission drew the attention of the Organizational Department, the CPSU Central Committee Administration of Affairs, and party committees at all levels to the need to galvanize intra-party work in order to resolutely enhance the discipline of party members and to ensure strict observance of the statutory requirements pertaining to membership subscriptions.

Expenditure of party funds has been comprehensively analyzed. It was noted that overspending was not recorded in any area. A positive assessment was made of the trend toward reducing spending on the construction of administrative buildings and the maintenance of the apparatus of central and local party organs. At the same time, the inexpediency of excessively economizing on funds allocated from the budget for mass political work or the needs of primary party organizations was pointed out. As in the previous year, party organizations have been making poor use of these funds (just 35.9 percent have been spent in the first half-year). The utilization of these funds is lower than the general indicator in a number of party organizations (just 8.5 percent in the primary party organizations of the Bashkir ASSR, and 27 percent in Chita Oblast).

Under present-day conditions it is especially important for the control (auditing) commissions of republic, oblast, kray, city, and rayon party organizations to work effectively. However, as was noted at the session, there has been no noticeable improvement in their work since the commissions' composition was renewed. Many important aspects of the financial and economic activity of party committees, and their enterprises and institutions have remained outside the sphere of attention of the new control organs.

Analysis of the information reaching the CPSU Central Control Commission from local level shows that there

has been a fall in the standard of auditing work in the party, and that certain control (auditing) commissions have adopted a superficial approach to the implementation of their functions.

At the same time, the inadequate attention shown by party committees to questions of the financial state of their party organizations' budgets and to questions of the replenishment of party coffers from additional sources of income was noted. Few republic, oblast, or kray party committees discussed control and auditing commission materials at their bureau sessions.

The CPSU Central Control Commission has instructed the CPSU Central Committee and all party committees to examine the state of financial and economic activity and to determine measures to strengthen Communists' party discipline, improve the economic efficiency of the work of enterprises and publishing houses, and ensure the strictest saving of party funds, in accordance with existing legislation on the legal protection for party property. The need was stressed for the fuller implementation of Communists' proposals on the shaping of the budget, a cardinal improvement in the briefing of party organizations on matters pertaining to the expenditure of the funds at the party's disposal, and the acceleration of the elaboration of corresponding normative and methodological documents.

All members of the CPSU Central Control Commission were instructed, together with control (auditing) commissions at the local level, to take part in running checks on the activity of party committees in fulfilling the budget in 1990 and to give them the necessary assistance in improving that work.

Taking part in the discussion on this issue were Comrade N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission; Comrade V.G. Zheltyakov, leader of a CPSU Central Control Commission subcommission and chief engineer at the Yaroslavl Motor Plant; Comrade M.I. Kodin, chairman of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Control Commission; Comrade N.N. Korablev, chairman of the Leningrad Oblast party organization's control and auditing commission, and senior officials from the Central Control Commission and Central Committee of the CPSU and of the Central Control Commission and Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party.

The session was chaired by Comrade B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission.

Domestic Instability Imperils Foreign Credit
PM0511104590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Diary: "What Do We Get Out of It?"]

[Text] In response to the call from those at the top for market thinking, the grassroots, in the process of restructuring themselves, are asking with increasing frequency and sternness the most market-minded of questions: What do we get out of it? This is the backdrop to the USSR president's current foreign visits. Moreover, it is not just joint political statements but something more material that is meant here—food, clothing, and hard currency, which can be used to buy both the former. We have roughly another \$2.5 billion in credit as a result of M.S. Gorbachev's trips to Spain and France. Just over \$9 per capita. Not very much, but better than nothing if sensible use is made of what we receive.

What is more, at the end of last week the heads of the 12 EEC countries meeting in Rome for a routine sitting said that they would respond immediately to a Soviet call for emergency action were Moscow to make such an appeal. This is interpreted as follows: By emergency aid West European leaders mean food in view of the coming barren winter. A common West European position has not yet been elaborated on broader economic aid or cooperation. This question has once again been put off until December. One of the main reasons being that they do not understand what is going on in our country. Or, more precisely, they understand what is going on but cannot work out what will come of it. Just like us.

Time is certainly flying by. I remember little more than a year ago, in September 1989, B.N. Yeltsin introducing the criterion for immediate success (what do we get out of it?) during his first trip to the United States—then just as a member of the Supreme Soviet and de facto leader of the radical opposition. An attempt was made to denigrate him by reprinting a scandalous article from an Italian newspaper, while he defeated his critics by buying 100,000 disposable syringes with royalties from his articles. His popularity soared even higher and the proposed criterion won acceptance. And has indisputably established itself since there have been far fewer commodities and hard currency since then and far more centers of power.

Now when the new Moscow Soviet leaders are being pestered with recriminations about frequent trips abroad, they say how much hard currency they have brought back from there for Muscovites. We have just learned from S.B. Stankevich, for instance, that Tokyo businessmen have given our capital \$1 million as a result of his recent trip to the Japanese capital with G.Kh. Popov. The Japanese are so rich that they do not know what to do with their money. They may shell out \$30-40 million for a painting by a well-known Impressionist. While they were grudging with Muscovites—just 10 cents each per head.

So, the market approach, the principle of "what do we get out of it" can be used however you like—it has both a serious and a somewhat comic side. However, we do not feel like laughing as the economic crisis increases. Every little helps. To "back" the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany Chancellor Kohl gave 15 billion

marks, 12 billion of them for free. During Gorbachev's visit President Mitterrand gave roughly \$1 billion; it is announced that this credit will be used above all for grain procurements from France: Despite our record harvest, we, as always, lack grain and another problem is that we lack the hard currency to buy foreign grain. Spain's Premier Gonzalez in his economically less powerful country than the FRG or France scratched around the granaries, appealed to business people, and displayed Spanish nobility and solidarity with those who are also bidding farewell to totalitarianism. Some \$1.5 billion in credit have been allocated for Soviet procurements of Spanish goods.

Western sources report that Gonzalez, who flew to Rome straight after his conversations with Gorbachev, described the dreadful situation in the Soviet economy at the summit meeting of the 12. One of his arguments for helping the Soviet Union was his forecast that the deepening crisis will result in millions of Soviet people who crave a proper wage, by Soviet standards, storming the gates of West European countries. This will create problems which could be bought off more easily and cheaply now.

"We" were a secondary issue in Rome. The creation of a currency union and the movement toward a single European currency was the key issue. According to current estimates, this will emerge before the end of the century. There was also another highly important question—that of political unity in West Europe. It also enshrines movement forward; only Margaret Thatcher opposed this.

West Europe is unswervingly moving toward unity, putting into effect in its own way the internationalist slogans that were customary for us quite recently. This is not, of course, proletarian but liberal-bourgeois or all-European internationalism. Extremists in our country have discarded not only proletarian but also any other kind of internationalism and are introducing customs houses and thinking about a separate currency, dozens of currencies, rather than a single currency. Abandoning the authoritarian features of the empire, too many people are unable to see and perceive other examples although they rear up in front of them. Well, this is historical retribution; by its very nature it has the destructive force and blindness that represent the reverse of unthinkingly critical insight. It is ridiculous to try and reason with the ninth wave. However, those attempting to ride it should remember that we may all lose out—both the center and the republics. Present dreams of a new Europe, a united Europe which includes the Soviet Union as a federation or confederation of sovereign republics will remain unrealized for the foreseeable future if the disintegration processes continue and deepen. A Europe that is the economic equal or superior of the United States and Japan and is practically resolving the questions of a single currency and political unification will try to cut itself off from our chaos.

"We have no idea who we are talking to in Moscow or who really holds power," London's DAILY TELEGRAPH conveys the impression made on an anonymous representative of the EC Commission, which acts as a combined economic general staff. It is becoming harder and harder to obtain foreign loans because former loans were spent in an inept manner, increasing the Soviet foreign debt to \$60 billion or so and reducing our reputation for ability to pay to rock bottom.

Immediately before M.S. Gorbachev's recent foreign visits he published a presidential decree giving foreign investors more rights and guarantees in the USSR. This was assessed positively in the West and to some extent has obviously made it easier to obtain Spanish and French credits. But no decrees will really be able to pay off as long as the dominant factor in the eyes of foreign business is the obvious uncertainty and instability in the Soviet Union. If the present unpredictable centrifugal tendencies are not held back by exercising authority, power, and reason, we will get less and less "against the security of Gorbachev" and the whole process of perestroika.

UN Should Mediate USSR Interethnic Disputes

91UN0189A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY
VESTNIK in Russian No 42, Oct 90 pp 1, 8

[Article by S. Dzarasov, head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Political Economy Department under the "Problems of the Federation" rubric: "From Quarrel to Peace"; article published adjacent to ref article]

[Text] Peace has long been indivisible, and what happens in one part of it is invariably reflected in all the others. For this reason the present political and economic crisis of the Soviet Union needs to be seen in both its internal and international aspects.

From the viewpoint of the internal sources of their emergence all such crises have one feature in common: An incapacity of the participants in the drama to opportunely determine upon preventive measures. These are usually urgent changes and, frequently, concessions also, of which the ruling powers prove incapable. The nature of political concessions is such, S. Zweig wrote, that they are always late.

But even made tardily, they lead not to a way out of a crisis but to its intensification. If the Soviet leadership had not simply permitted the East European countries to democratize but had itself initiated the withdrawal of its forces, as representatives of the Soviet public proposed on the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the USSR's positions in these countries would today be far stronger. If Moscow itself had proposed a new Union treaty and that independence for the Baltic republics for which it is prepared today, the republics would not be demanding secession from the USSR, and relations with them would be considerably warmer.

Perestroika is threatened most today by national conflicts. In the USSR, which is inhabited by more than 100 different peoples—so dissimilar in language, mental makeup and temperament, religious beliefs, and historical-cultural and ethnic traditions—hotbeds of national conflicts are beginning to get out of control, which could shortly lead to the profound destabilization of the country. The impending danger cannot be seen merely as our internal concern. The country's disintegration into hostile national and ethnic formations could cancel out the prospects for a viable democracy and would preclude the possibility of creating in the country a single and efficient market, with which we are currently linking our hopes for a way out of the crisis.

The failure of perestroika would lead not only to a destabilization of the situation in the USSR but would inevitably upset the stability and security of the whole world community. It is for this reason that national settlement in the Soviet Union should be seen not simply as its own internal problem but as a fundamental part of world politics.

And an attempt to preserve the status quo here would, it seems, be futile. We should not cling to a slightly renewed old model but, on the contrary, should vigorously and emphatically pursue a policy of anticipating fundamental change—this is the sole means of preserving Union relations in a new quality.

The decades of the unitary state were by no means friendship of the peoples, as it seemed to us. On the contrary, they nurtured mutual grievances, complaints, and suspicions. It is on this actual fact which the present centrifugal processes are based.

It should be borne in mind also that there is a colossal distance between the proclamation of political or administrative independence and the achievement of economic independence ensuring a high living standard and solid international status. Not only nationalist demagogues and extremists but also perfectly moderate radicals usually fail to take this into consideration. It is sufficient, meanwhile, to look at the list of suppliers and consumers of products of nearby enterprises for it to become clear how closely their production rhythm is linked with a country's geography. It is impossible to renounce the evolved economic relations within the framework of the USSR in the same way that it is impossible to wriggle out of your own skin. Even the East European countries will for a certain number of years be forced to maintain close economic ties with the Soviet Union. The West simply cannot be a substitute for Moscow for them in a short space of time.

The demand for the republics' state independence is inspired not only by national aspirations to organize their life in their own way but also by hopes for effective relations with other countries. This fact, to judge by everything, is causing the Soviet leadership particular concern, and the tenacity of old ideas is reflected here also. In fact, the republics' extensive international ties

should not be feared but supported for the purpose of creating the more prosperous economy and culture of each republic and the Union as a whole. The renunciation of imperial ambitions would free the peoples, including, first and foremost, the Russian people, from many economic and moral burdens which they have had to bear up to now.

As far as the regulation of interethnic conflicts is concerned, the broad participation of the world community in the Soviet Union's affairs would afford unique, albeit nontraditional, opportunities for this. It is a question of making intelligent use to this end of the authority and influence of the international community with regard for the particular position and authority of M.S. Gorbachev in the modern world.

The use of force to prevent an escalation of violence is inevitable. But it should be a means of forestalling tragedies, not a belated reaction to them. Even less can the Army be thrown against the civilian population, as was the case in Tbilisi and Baku. Unfortunately, the recent edict of the president of the USSR banning the creation of armed formations is not a measure which guarantees people's safety.

It is also the duty of the government to minimize the Army's physical and moral losses. Our boys are today performing a dangerous service, often truly being the sole guarantor of people's lives. In order to ensure the safety and efficiency of their activity it needs to be made a subordinate component of an overall plan whose main content should be granting real independence to the republics. Only by removing the objective causes of the malaise will extremism be deprived of a mass base and support.

Instead of a passive response to the fatal development of events and groundless hopes for the removal of conflicts by way of dexterous apparatus maneuvers and a new version of the Union treaty, we propose an enterprising policy of preventive measures based on a new vision of our future and a combination of internal and external settlement factors.

The future of the USSR, in our view, should be seen as a distinctive type of confederation. It is necessary to move from the present unitary system to something akin to the British Commonwealth, but with far closer ties.

The present development of events, meanwhile, not only rules out a return to what went before but is a threat to the confederal prospect. For this reason the national enmity in the USSR should be seen not as one of many complex problems but as a tragedy which could plunge the country into the convulsions of a new civil war. In the face of this menacing danger we should be prepared to abandon all prejudices, however dear they are to us, for the sake of establishing civil peace.

Such an understanding and evaluation of the situation is, in our view, an essential prerequisite for a new approach to the problem, opening a way to its solution. The Union

republics are formally considered independent state formations. Therefore, even those which remain within the Union, not to mention those which leave it, may be seen as independent subjects of international relations. The settlement of their relations among themselves and also with the Soviet Union would in this case be an international problem.

It would be necessary for M.S. Gorbachev to use his immense international authority for this. The leadership which he heads could ask the world community, in the shape of the United Nations, for mediation, and the latter could respond to such an appeal. The United Nations and the Soviet leadership have a mutual interest in a settlement of the conflicts and a stabilization of the situation in the USSR.

The republics so desiring must acquire independence. But their governments need to be told unequivocally that recognition on the part of the world community would be directly connected with the constructiveness of their approach to relations with the USSR. Secession from the Union should be accompanied by the signing of agreements fully guaranteeing the USSR's interests. This applies to supplies of products of vital importance to the Union, property, and the operating schedule of enterprises, transport and communications, and other matters. There must be guarantees against the new states joining military blocs, and the conditions for the functioning, where necessary, of Soviet military facilities on their territory should be specified.

Particular significance is attached to the question of the positions of citizens of nonindigenous nationality. The demands for independence are in many instances currently being combined with the suppression of "inherent" national minorities. Yet the sacred right of each person, ensuing from the General Declaration, to organize his life and happiness as he sees fit requires guarantees of free choice of place of residence, and this should be sought through the demand for compliance with human rights based on international norms, the possibility of autonomy, unimpeded communication with the Union, and other guarantees.

All these conditions should be enshrined in agreements signed by the USSR and the corresponding state, and their guarantor should be the United Nations, what is more. It is essential to assume these commitments before the world, and their violation should entail palpable sanctions.

In our view, the question of admitting all Union republics as UN members could also be examined in connection with what has been set forth. The justified misgivings which the West harbored in the past, that they would vote according to the directives of the Kremlin, are today meaningless. Such a step would, meanwhile, increase these republics' responsibility for compliance with international rules of law. Of course, this question should in each case be decided individually and should directly depend on the constructiveness of the republic's

policy (observance of human rights, renunciation of territorial claims, and so forth).

The question of granting the USSR large-scale credit is currently being discussed in the West. This also could be a means of active conciliation. Foreign governments could, following consultations with the Soviet leadership, enter into direct negotiations with the republics about extending credit and other types of assistance. However, it would need to be made known to the governments of the republics that financial circles are disturbed by the political instability of the recipients and would make assistance dependent on strict compliance with the commitments assumed by the latter. This does not, of course, rule out purely financial guarantees.

The United Nations' arbitration and supervisory functions in regulating interethnic conflicts are vitally necessary not only for the Soviet Union today but (in light of world development prospects) for the United Nations themselves. In the future there will be many racial, national, ethnic, and religious conflicts in the world, and the United Nations cannot remain aloof from them. Its supra-state role will grow. We should contribute to the enhancement of its authority and the formulation of the principles and the mechanism of their regulation through our cooperation with it.

Particular mention should be made in this connection of the status of Nagornyy Karabakh, which is the bone of contention between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Attempts at cosmetic solutions here have manifestly fallen through. In our opinion, the sole way to effectively settle this problem is to approach it not as an internal but as a serious international conflict.

The particular status of this autonomous formation, whereby it is under Union jurisdiction, should be determined by a tripartite agreement among the USSR, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. This question should be decided in a package with all problems of the settlement of the republics' relations among themselves and with the Union Government.

A decisive role in these negotiations should be performed by the United Nations. It is this authoritative organization which could impress upon the Governments of Armenia and Azerbaijan that their new international status (entry into the United Nations and such), just like their relations with other countries, would be directly dependent on their readiness to agree to compromise. It would also be essential to buttress this policy with the concerted position of the leading powers of the West. They have a wide spectrum of influence both directly and through third countries ethnically connected with the republics and also through the national diaspora at home. Any separatist interference by foreign states in the interests of individual nations to the detriment of others must be ruled out.

It would be expedient to open a UN mission in Nagornyy Karabakh to monitor compliance with agreements. Interethnic peacekeeping forces could be committed to

the oblast also. It is essential to extend a demilitarized zone between the two republics, which should also be controlled by UN forces. It is also essential to open missions for monitoring observance of human rights in Yerevan and Baku. Any violation of commitments assumed before the world should automatically entail the onset of palpable sanctions.

It would seem to us that such an approach to the problem has the principal advantage of simultaneously commissioning most powerful factors curbing extremism while removing the objective causes of nationalism.

If the Soviet Union consents to the use of the authority of the United Nations for settling its interethnic conflicts and the United Nations finds it possible to render individual republics assistance free of charge, the USSR should also increase its contribution to the budget of this organization in hard currency and rubles. It should not stint in this case, first, because UN assistance to the Soviet republics would obviously increase its contribution proper and, second, because the USSR has no other way of regulating the conflicts and contradictions tearing it apart. The globalization of interethnic conflicts may be prevented only by the globalization of the settlement.

Simultaneously with all this, of course, it is essential to continue to work on elaborating a new Union treaty, in accordance with which the USSR should be a unique confederation uniting dozens of peoples in a single whole, in accordance with their particular and general interests and traditions.

Writers Weekly Independence Move Criticized

91UN0160A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Vladimir Karpov, first secretary, USSR Writers Union Board: "The Law Is Not a Connecting-Rod: A Conflict Situation: Arguments in a Dispute"]

[Text] All us writers nowadays are readers of laws: the "Law on Taxation," the "Law on the Press." As bestsellers, they are taken into consideration by everybody: writers and publishers, financial inspectors and poets, jurists and swindlers.... That is fine. In a state based on the rule of law the law should be above everything! But here is the trouble: in the very first steps taken by our life based on law it has suddenly been noticed that right, its common sense, and its logic are slipping out of the law.

And it is about this kind of "black hole," which allows a one-sided interpretation of the articles contained in the "Law on the Press" that I would like to share some thoughts with you in the present remarks.

What is most striking when you become acquainted with items which have been appearing regularly in newspapers and journals, as well as on radio and television broadcasts, by those persons who interpret this document most energetically to their own advantage? In the first place—the desire to "subordinate" the Law to their

own interest and that of their group. According to Tsar Grokh's principle, which has become well-known with time: "The law is a connecting-rod..." And still, according to a saying which has become very fashionable nowadays: The fishing is better in water that has been stirred up.

But just how can the contents of the law be successfully stirred up, when they have been fundamentally edited and distilled in parliamentary discussions? Here it is obvious that you cannot get by without some black magic. Of course, it is not an easy matter to dispel its "charms," which are being circulated in millions of copies. Nevertheless, let us attempt to accomplish this task. And may we be helped in this by the Law, common sense, and the collective reason of writers, inasmuch as what we will be talking about are the publications of the USSR Writers Union.

Let us take the principal question—one which requires a particularly careful, well-balanced approach: Who has, and under what circumstances, the right to found mass media?

For our creative union, which has more than 10,000 members and whose efforts have been applied to create and support, develop and reinforce by its authority several popular publications, this question is, without any doubt, vitally important: a creative union can exist and develop, defend the interests of writers and assist in improving the literary process only if it has at its disposal its own journal, newspaper, and book-publishing base. That is the way it was and still is. And this is attested by the data of publication, which show a clear predominance of those belonging to the USSR Writers Union. But no matter how regrettable or lamentable this may be, there leaders (who, by the way, were approved and appointed to their high positions by decisions of the USSR Writers Union Board Secretariat) who, without consulting the writers' community of our multinational creative union, are now attempting to arbitrarily withdraw the journals entrusted to their care out from under the roof of the USSR Writers Union. Furthermore, they are even prepared—by way of seeking a necessary stratagem—to abandon All-Union status for their journals in favor of republic-level status. The staff members of certain editorial offices which issue publications of the USSR Writers Union wish nothing more or less than to become the sole founders of these publications, which were essentially established long ago by our creative union. In this connection, we should cite Article 7 of the Law on the Press, which states that the right to found mass media belongs to "creative unions, cooperative, religious, or other associations of citizens created in accordance with the Law, as well as to labor collectives and to citizens...."

If we proceed from the letter and the meaning of this paragraph, then it is clear that what we are talking about here is specifically the founding of the so-called press

organs to be newly created or re-created. Because, of course, something which has already been founded cannot be founded.

To this, the lawyers hired by the "do-it-yourself founders" reply as follows: But, you know, the concept of a "founder" as such did not exist in our legislation. That is true. But does it follow from that there were no real, actual founders? Does it follow that the actual founders (creators or establishers) of certain press organs at the precise moment when the Law on the Press went into effect became a "fiction," lost all their rights and ceased to bear responsibilities with regard to their "babies"? Let us take a simple example. A plant collective decided to have its own newspaper: they gave it a name, set up assigned tasks, appointed staff members, and approved an editorial collegium. In filling out the procedural forms for registration, who would function as the founder of this newspaper—the plant collective or the collective of the newspaper's editors? Is the sense of the law, the brunt of its intention such, that the editors' interests are placed on a higher plane than the interests of the plant's labor collective?

If we take the writers press organ, the legal situation would remain the same. Recognizing the preeminent right of the editorial collective to found an organ on its own or to replace the actual founder with a new one signifies just one thing: the editorial leadership acquires the juridical opportunity to dictate its own will to the Writers Union, i.e., to that very organization which created the organ in question in order to solve its own basic problems.

Let us say that the collective of a journal's editorial office has about 20 or 30 staff members. Approximately half of them constitute the technical personnel. Thus, the opinion of about 10 literary persons and journalists, albeit endowed with a variety of talents, acquires the force of law, whereas the opinion of hundreds of members of the USSR Writers Union Board and of thousands of so-called "rank-and-file" writers is left out of consideration. This is, to put it bluntly, the most pettifogging and unpardonable "argument" of the present-day "do-it-yourself founders"—they are the "labor collective," while 10,000 writers, who created these press organs and gained popularity and authority for them by means of their own works—they are not the collective at all but merely "something or other" which does not need to be taken into consideration at all.

If we are to speak about the essence of the matter, i.e., without legal niceties or nitpicking, what is happening is the seizure of a press organ belonging to the Writers Union, its alienation from the writers collective. A part is dictating its conditions to the whole; a minority is imposing its own will on the majority. Just who gave it the right to do such things? Could it really be the Law on the Press? No, judging by all we know, this "right" is inspired by personal ambition or by group interests.

The Law on the Press contains Article 13, which provides for the high-priority right of an editorial office to found organs only in cases where the founder has quit his previous organ. Even on this point, however, the lawyers hired by the "do-it-yourself founders" again cite the lack of the concept of "founder" in our legislation prior to 1 August 1990.

It turns out that, according to the logic of these lawyers, there was no Writers Union, it was neither founder nor creator, and hence was not the actual founder of its own publications.

But permit me once again to disagree with such, to put it mildly, strange conclusions. All the more so in that our viewpoint is unambiguously supported by the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet entitled "On Putting Into Effect the USSR Law 'On the Press and Other Mass Media.'" Here in Paragraph 2 the following is stated: "It is established that the statutes on registering mass media, as provided for by Articles 8 and 9 of the Law mentioned above, shall be extended to those mass media which were created prior to the present Law going into effect...." What is being discussed here is unambiguously solely a matter of registration; it does not pertain to the need to re-found a publication and hence to re-define its founder. All the publications of the Writers Union have been coming out for many years and have been subject to registration, whereas those persons who have "founded" these publications, albeit in a republic-level ministry, have essentially created a new press organ. The Writers Union is entirely justified in acquiring new staff members for its own All-Union publications and to return their own names to them by a court procedure. And the newly created (republic-level) publications must find new titles as well as sponsors for their imminent, difficult existence.

The conflict which has arisen between the USSR Writers Union and certain editorial collectives goes beyond the framework of a juridical or purely legal dispute. It has taken on political, social, and moral features: because, after all, the interests of broad masses of writers are affected. In numerous telegrams and letters they are calling upon the leadership of the USSR Writers Union to "protect and defend the economic interests of all writers throughout the country from the poorly thought-out and egotistical plans of the journal editors (Ion Chobanu, Moldavia), "strictly safeguard the properties accumulated by many generations of Soviet writers" (a group of writers from Omsk). Members of the USSR Writers Union view as a real danger the fact that the "initial do-it-yourself seizure of journals and newspapers by their editorial staffs could bring about an abrogation of the freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The 'group-minded editors' would never allow an outside author to appear in the pages of publications which they already consider to be 'their own property.' This would be more terrible than state censorship" (I. Vinogradov, Leningrad). "To separate or isolate the USSR Writers Union from ownership of its newspaper and journals would mean preparing the soil for the USSR Writers

Union's self-liquidation. Who would benefit from such an action?" (Ivan Myalo, Minsk).

In these and dozens of other collective and individual appeals to the USSR Writers Union Secretariat one cannot help but feel the pain and alarm of the writers community for our union's future, for our fraternity of writers. The Secretariat of the USSR Writers Union Board considers that, under these conditions, we will simply be forced to resume publication of our own LITERATURNAYA GAZETA—the organ of the USSR Writers Union, a truly writers, All-Union newspaper. And we are prepared to compete, to have a creative type of rivalry, with the republic-level SVOBODNAYA TRIBUNA. And as to financial relations, we will be participating in joint shareholding enterprises because under market conditions life will compel use to earn money.

Nowadays a great deal is being written about how necessary it is to learn from the West. And, frankly, why not adopt what is useful, what has been tried and found true in practice? Let us take a look, for example, and the processes taking place in publishing houses and press organs. What is happening in the West includes mergers, consolidations, or buy-outs (some organizations have a bit more money than others) of newspapers, journals, and radio and television companies. Powerful concerns and whole empires of news and information organs are being created. But our "separatists" are ruining the still-strong Writers Union, which is capable of uniting the efforts of literary persons in order to survive under the conditions of the draconian tax system, paper "hunger," printing vacuum, and the unpredictable conditions of a free market. And so it turns out that the "separatists" are thinking only about their own incomes. From a moral point of view, this is unseemly with regard to their fellow-writers, while from a financial standpoint it is short-sighted. It will very soon reveal itself as anarchic, an unplanned situation into which they will be hurled by themselves. I do not want to predict trouble for them, but I am convinced that they will soon remember the Writers Union and will ask for subsidies such as, by the way, will be enjoyed in 1991 by many of our publications, for example, LITERATURNAOYE OBOZRENIYE (248,000 rubles), VOPROSY LITERATURY (120,000), TEATR (150,000), and others.

Of course, the future will determine who is right. But we must live until that future. And, therefore, proceeding upon the undoubted right of writers themselves to determine their own future, the working secretariat of the USSR Writers Union Board has decided to conduct an express referendum in order to find out the opinion of every writer concerning the situation which has evolved. And then, by relying on this opinion from all the writers, the Plenum (in November 1990) will adopt as decision as to how writers are to live, if not for many years ahead, at least until the next (Ninth) Writers Congress, which will take place during the second quarter of 1991.

And, in conclusion, I would like to remind you of that fine old Russian proverb: When you play a home game, even the walls cheer for you!

TRUD Supplement Trial Issue Published

91UN0160B Moscow TRUD in Russian
25 Oct 90 p 8

[Unattributed article: "Hello KHOZYAYN!: Trial Issue of Weekly TRUD Supplement"]

[Text] In Vl. Dal's "Interpretive Dictionary" the following proverb is appended to the definition of the word "khozyayn" [master]: "If the master is good, things are also good at home; if the master is bad, things will also be bad." Since olden times the word "master" has been used to designate that man who performs his work, whether small- or large-scale, zealously, with loving care. And, therefore, when we were thinking about a supplement to the newspaper TRUD, one which would be devoted to the problems of making the transition to market-type relations, we decided to name it by this old-fashioned, basic word: KHOZYAYN.

A trial issue of the new publication has come out. It contains stories about the development of free enterprise in the USSR, the merits and shortcomings of the cooperative movement, the initial steps taken by the All-Union Conference of Cooperative Staff Members' Trade Unions.... Soviet and American specialists furnish answers to the following questions: How can a person open his own business nowadays? And how can he achieve success in it? The trial issue also contains materials about consumer-rights protection, as well as surveys and commentaries about the economic situation in this country and throughout the world.

The pages of KHOZYAYN likewise contain quite a bit of news about current events and educational information, meetings with interesting people, along with advice for gardeners, video-film buffs, rock-music fans, and young marrieds.

KHOZYAYN arrived at the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks in a limited amount. But if you succeed in buying it and read it, please send your opinions and remarks about this new publication to the editors of TRUD. What would you like to see in our supplement?

Poll Shows Less Support for CPSU, Army

PM0211154090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No. 43, 23-29 Oct 90 p 40

[Article by Aleksey Levinson: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the KGB and the Army Are Losing Their Most Loyal Supporters"]

[Text] Fluctuations in the mood of the general public can be detected in the opinion poll carried out by the All-Union Public Opinion Study Centre under the authority of Tatyana Zaslavskaya, Member of the Academy of Sciences.

The Triangle For decades, the power in this country has rested on the triangle made up of the Communist Party, the KGB and the army. The aforementioned survey shows that these organizations are losing the people's trust. Of all those who expressed a preference, the number that gave these organizations a full vote of confidence had fallen one and a half times in six months (admittedly, they were some six months - December 1989 to July 1990). The army fared best, getting 44 percent public support in December, and 35 percent in July, losing in all nine percent of its faithful. The KGB got the thumbs up from only twenty-four percent of all those questioned, and the Communist Party only fourteen percent. This means that the KGB and the CPSU have lost each fourteen percent of their undivided support. So if for the KGB this is a loss of under a third of its public support, then the Party has mislaid the trust of nearly half of those who once knew how, as the phrase went, to believe without question.

The driving force and the military reserve In the ranks of public organizations once were included two of the closest allies of the party, namely, the trade unions and the Komsomol. Well, how are things with them? The number of people fully backing the trade unions in general, and the AUCCTU in particular, is around 18 percent. Belief in the Komsomol has dropped 50 percent.

Law enforcement agencies 18 percent expressed full support for the police. These days, the police occupy a much larger space in the mass media than do the daily workings of the KGB. Thirty-three percent more pollees than usual have even refrained from saying anything definite about the state security bodies. On the other hand, the number of those who commented on the work of the police is greater than usual; which is, probably, due to personal experience of people who have had some contact with the police. As to the KGB, people have not often been involved in its work (or have not often been aware of it...).

If the army, the law enforcement agencies and the party with the mass organizations supporting them formed the backbone of the old order, then what can a new order rely on, and how great is the confidence it enjoys? The courts and public prosecution got 18 percent support and 19 percent absolute mistrust. The instability of balance in this survey lies in the fact that an almost record number of those questioned have given the somewhat ambiguous reply, "they haven't exactly done much to earn my trust."

The executive power is presented in the question with the highest echelons—the USSR Council of Ministers. They have a fairly equal share of fervent supporters and violent opponents, 20 and 21 percent respectively. Sixty percent gave no definite answer at all.

The legislature The number of people who have given full support to the Supreme Soviet was 2.25 times as large as those expressing mistrust. Nearly a third of the polled spoke of unshakeable belief, and slightly less of a

belief with certain reservations. In other words, the country's Supreme Soviet has enjoyed for the moment a sufficient share of popular trust, though there is a discernible trend towards gradual decline. The other factor—the appearance of the republican Soviets. The poll covered several republics, so we cannot discuss the popularity of Russian or Ukrainian parliament, but of a range of republican Soviets. Forty percent believe wholly in their top echelons of power. Twenty-two percent have expressed their support, but with reservations. The proportion of those who denied their trust was the smallest of this kind on the survey—just over ten percent.

On the way to the shrine There is, without a doubt, a far greater sympathy for religious institutions, Christian and Muslim. A faction of people unwilling to gear their support in this direction was indeed less than 10 percent. Thirty-six percent were in favour of the clerical institutions, showing that any kind of religious organization comes second in public opinion only to the Supreme Soviets of the republics.

The fourth power The free press in democratic societies is labeled the fourth power. Central publications, radio and television got a vote of no confidence from thirteen percent of the polled. Full support and support with reservations went 34 and 35 percent respectively. So the mass media move into third place in the running for the position of the public institution enjoying unconditional support. If you take count of a summary, estimation and include all those who expressed support and those who gave it with reservations, then that would mean that the emergent free press is the public's favourite institution.

Kalugin Case Against Ryzhkov To Proceed

LD0211212290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1622 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—Nikolay Romanenkov, member of the Moscow City Court, has adopted a decision to commence proceedings on the complaint by Oleg Kalugin against Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR council of Ministers, who on 29 June 1990 stripped the KGB major-general of his title, the newspaper IZVESTIYA reports today.

Nikolay Romanenkov earlier refused to set this complaint in motion, substantiating this by saying that it was not Nikolay Ryzhkov who personally "removed" the shoulder boards from Oleg Kalugin, but the USSR Council of Ministers—a collegiate body. Courts do not examine complaints against illegal actions by collegiate bodies committed before 1 July 1990.

However, Oleg Kalugin and Boris Kuznetsov, his representative, managed to find proof casting doubt upon the fact that a sitting of the Council of Ministers was held on 29 July. The collegium of the RSFSR Supreme Court on civilian affairs found the ruling of the Moscow City Court to be groundless. Now, Nikolay Romanenkov has set the complaint in motion and, as he says, it will be examined by the court along with Kalugin's complaint

against Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, who by his order stripped the former subordinate of his pension.

As is known, the hearing of that case has been postponed until 11 November, since the Moscow City Court is awaiting explanations from the USSR Council of Ministers—on the basis of what was Kalugin deprived of his title—and also a certificate from the main military procuracy on the course of the investigation into the criminal case on the divulgence by the former KGB major-general of any state secret. As Nikolay Romanenkov reported, by 2 November the court already had received from the procuracy the necessary documents. The Council of Ministers is keeping silent so far.

Yeltsin Message Featured in New Newspaper

LD0311072990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] The first issue of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA hit the newstands of Soyuzpechat today. On its front page it carries a message in which Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, addresses its staff members and readers. In reply to a question as to how one would like to see the newspaper, he says: Independent of the tastes and biases of any leading officials, including those of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the newspaper should be as democratic and tolerant of various points of view and positions as possible.

The ecclesiastical authorities join temporal power in wishing the newspaper success.

In his address, entitled May God Allow Russia To Find the Path to the Light!, Aleksey II, the patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, calls for the revival of the primordial Russian morality and spirituality and calls on people to rise above current passions.

Radio Moscow journalists also wish their colleagues success.

Aktyubinsk Student Murder Trial Opens

PM0211141590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by G. Loriya: "Fatal Shot"]

[Text] Aktyubinsk—A shot that proved fatal for student Bisenov rang out a week before the last New Year. The shot was fired by a militiaman. Was he right to press the trigger?

The trial over this case, which has caused a sensation in the city, has begun in the Aktyubinsk Oblast court. At the request of the student's parents the investigation has been assigned not to local lawyers but to lawyers invited from Uralsk.

The court must find the answer to many questions: Was the deceased armed with a stick, was there an opportunity to avoid taking the conflict to an extreme, was there a need to use weapons?...

Yakovlev on Value of Studying History

91UN0110B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 18 Oct 90 p 1

[Questions addressed by schoolchildren of Sverdlovsk School No. 64 to Presidential Council member A.N. Yakovlev, followed by his response: "Political Academy: Must We Join the Komsomol?—Presidential Council Member Answers Schoolchildren's Questions"]

[Text]Dear Aleksandr Nikolayevich!

Would you please answer our questions?

1. What is your attitude toward the study of history and social sciences today within the framework of the school program?
2. We have seen the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] change from a political social organization in the schools into a mass cultural organization. What is your opinion—should we join this organization, or would it be better if the age requirement for joining were raised and we were to seek other forms of work?

Sverdlovsk School No. 64, 11th "A" Class, Sverdlovsk-45.

Dear children!

Without any long introduction, I will directly answer your questions as they were presented to me.

1. Concerning my attitude toward the study of history and social sciences today within the framework of the school program—I am "for" their study.

The purpose of school, the way I understand it, is not only to give you a certain store of knowledge. Most importantly, it is to teach you to think, to analyze, to be able to find sound answers to even the most tormenting questions of existence. But how difficult all this is! And how many young people fall into despair, losing their way in the labyrinth of the search for truth. Unless knowledge is vitally necessary in everyday life, it will be forgotten. But a man who is able to think never loses this acquired gift.

But how can one learn to think without knowing what is most important—the history of man, one's country, and society? History is not simply an aggregate of facts or just a sequence of events in their inexorable advance. History is primarily the development of the human spirit, human thought, human consciousness.

We—and I am talking about myself—learned through our school program mainly how the great minds of humanity erred in some way, were limited in some

aspect, etc. We learned far less and far worse how they were able to attain their great discoveries and accomplishments.

At the same time, our consciousness was oppressed by judgments not subject to question, through which unanimity of thought was established, which of course precluded creativity and search.

This has made it all the more difficult today to reach the truth, to acquire knowledge, to get proper answers. And the need for all this is not just personal. It is impossible to understand the sources of our present difficulties and the reasons behind them, impossible to find reliable ways out of these situations, if one does not know in every detail how they began and progressed, what choices were made and why.

All of this is necessary not just for perestroika, and not just for the sake of perestroika. What books today are among the most popular, the most widely read? Historical books are right up front, books on subjects from recent and ancient history, native and foreign, but especially one's own history. And so people need these books, and films as well. But they need them because with a knowledge of history one better knows oneself.

People often ask—can we study history and social sciences the same way this was done 10, 20, and 50 years ago?

If we really mean "the same way," then of course it is impossible, and the question becomes rhetorical. But why must it be "the same way"? And why the two extremes—either study "the same way" or not at all?

They are quite correct when they say that lying between the extremes is not the truth but the issue. And the issue, in my view, is as follows.

Of course there will be no new textbooks—not new in the full sense of the word, i.e., with respect to the scientific concepts they contain, the full scope of facts and depth of their interpretation, with human, non-bureaucratized language—tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. This effort will be complicated and prolonged, and disputes still range about a great many aspects.

All the same, it seems to me that today we can approach the study of history and social sciences entirely differently using our present textbooks and other materials. First of all we must learn to distinguish fact from interpretation, conceptualization, evaluation. We must know the facts and search for their logical, emotional, and other connections and reasons.

But we must also remember that in assessing the past we are not pronouncing sentence. We are striving to comprehend the spiritual world of our fathers and forefathers, so as to be able to gain a more certain footing in the present.

Furthermore—we cannot, it seems to me, approach any discipline with the expectation of obtaining just some

sort of information, some volume of factual data. All sciences are developing. And the disputes surrounding the ideas of modern physics or biology are in no way less impassioned than those surrounding modern interpretations of history. Therefore, I do not look at the ambiguities of judgments and their clashing with one another as anything too tragic. It is for each generation to resolve its own disputes, find its own truths. But a sense of morality and the ability to think are necessary for all this. If the lessons of history and social sciences help you acquire both—wonderful. But we will be disputing judgments and outlooks for a long time to come.

2. Concerning joining the Komsomol. In my view this is a matter of personal conscience for each individual—when and where to join, what to engage in. Some things in life have to be decided by people individually, not by following the wind of fashion, some political or other trend, wherever it might lead.

But let us try to look at this from the other side: somewhat, from another viewpoint. The Komsomol is often criticized today—intensely, and to a great extent justly.

Yes, you can refrain from joining the Komsomol. You can wait. You can seek out new forms of work. But you can also strive to refashion the Komsomol, make it the organization you want to have in your school. If, of course, you want to have it.

Let us learn to live by our minds, but not jump to the other extreme where everyone marches to the beat of a different drummer.

Things will be difficult in the purely practical respect—devising things on your own, convincing others, reaching agreement with them, and in the moral aspect too—for the entire responsibility will lie not on some other person, but on you yourself—did I decide properly, act the right way, properly gauge my own strengths and capabilities?

You are just now entering life. And your life will be what you yourself make it. Therefore I wish you independence, endowment with a kind heart and sharp wit, and indefatigable energy. With this, life's successes will necessarily follow.

Freedom has arrived—venture out.

All the best,

[Signed] A. Yakovlev.

(Published with the permission of the author and the 11th "A" Class of School No. 64, Sverdlovsk-45).

Economic

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Foreign Currency Fund

LD0211175190 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has signed a decree to establish a federal-republican foreign currency fund to guarantee, among other things, that the country will pay back its external liabilities.

The decree "On Special Procedures for Using Foreign-Currency Resources in 1991", which was published here today, provides for the fund to be formed with deductions from the export revenue of enterprises, amalgamations and organisations, excluding joint ventures.

It will serve to meet priority economic and consumer needs, put foreign currency resources to efficient use, and create conditions for the guaranteed Soviet repayment of foreign debts, the decree says.

It establishes a federal-republican foreign currency committee consisting of heads of government from constituent republics and the chairman of the federal cabinet's State Foreign Economic Commission.

The committee will work out and coordinate foreign currency and import policies, distribute the fund's resources among priority projects, monitor efforts ensuring that Soviet foreign liabilities are paid off, map out measures to develop the country's export potential, and deal with other nationwide issues of foreign currency regulation.

The decree binds enterprises, amalgamations and organizations regardless of by whom they are owned and departmental and territorial affiliation, but excluding joint ventures, in 1991 to sell the Bank for Foreign Economic Affairs 40 per cent of their foreign currency export revenue for roubles at the commercial exchange rate of the USSR State Bank in order to ensure the repayment of the Soviet foreign debt.

The decree instructs enterprises, amalgamations and organisations—after the mandatory sale of foreign currency for paying off the foreign debt and the formation of their own foreign currency funds—to sell 90 per cent of the remaining foreign currency revenue to the federal-republican foreign currency fund and the other ten per cent to the foreign currency funds of constituent republics and local councils for roubles at the commercial exchange rate of the USSR State Bank.

Under the decree, the setting of export and import quotas and the licensing of exports and imports from 1991 will be transferred to the federal-republic regime of regulation.

Quotas on products of national significance (oil, gas, gold, diamonds, other gems, special-purpose machinery

and some other goods enumerated in a list agreed with constituent republics) will be set by federal agencies.

In keeping with the decree, all payments under foreign economic transactions in 1991 will be made through the bank for foreign economic affairs or other authorized banks.

National Income Expected To Fall 4-5 Percent

LD0511104890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0930 GMT 5 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] According to a report of the USSR State Statistical Committee, a fall in the country's national income of four to five percent is to be expected by the end of the year. And more and more will have to be bought from abroad.

Shatalin, Others Send 'Message' on 500 Days Plan

PM0511130090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 4 Nov 90 p 2

["Message" from S. Shatalin, N. Petrakov, G. Yavlinskiy, S. Aleksashenko, A. Vavilov, L. Grigoryev, M. Zadornov, V. Martynov, V. Mashchits, A. Mikhaylov, B. Fedorov, T. Yarygina, Ye. Yasin: "Why the '500 Days' Program Is Unrealizable Today"]

[Text] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published a message 5 September headlined "Man; Freedom; The Market" by the 13 people who formulated the economic reform headed by Academician Shatalin. Two months have elapsed. Here we have another message from the 13....

The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet decided 31 October to begin implementing the republic program for the stabilization of the economy and the transition to the market. I. Silayev, chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, said in his speech that the countdown for the implementation of the republic program begins 1 November. The press seized on this statement, proclaiming that the "500 days" program had begun. However, deputies, the Russian government, and specialists realize that the "500 days" program can no longer be implemented in the form in which it was submitted to the USSR president and the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and approved by the Russian legislature.

We consider it necessary to explain our understanding of what is happening.

The essence of the "Transition to the Market" program is to stabilize the country's economic situation on the basis of the accelerated development of market relations. The main idea of the program presupposed vigorous, urgent steps to improve finances and money circulation, to be followed by liberalization of prices. Otherwise the

removal of price control would result in general uncontrolled price hikes. At the same time there should be rapid destatization, development of enterprise and a market infrastructure, and economic demonopolization, designed to start up within a relatively short period (the 500 days) a self-regulatory market mechanism allowing opportunities for an economic boom to open up.

The program's implementation envisaged a number of general political conditions: unity, speedy resolute action, coordination of all economic and political decisions adopted by the organs of power and their subordination to the tasks of implementing reform, and the restructuring and cadre renewal of union management organs in order to restore trust in them among the republics and the population.

Unfortunately, it must be said that these conditions are not being fulfilled. Moreover, a different reform program, based on the logic of documents prepared by the USSR Government, is effectively being implemented.

What has happened if two months after work was completed on the "500 days" program we have to say that it has broken down?

First, the program was based on an analysis of the actual state of the economy, and it was the rapid increase in crisis tendencies that dictated the extremely compressed period for stabilization which it envisaged. However, because discussion of the program at the USSR Supreme Soviet was dragged out and it was decided to amend it by combining it with the government program, the start of reform was postponed by at least a month—or one-third of the time remaining until the year end. Naturally, all the measures scheduled for this period have been postponed. Some should have been completed by the year end (because of the annual cycle of financial and economic activity). These include the restructuring of the banking system, reform of the budget mechanism, reform of turnover tax, and so on. The practical formulation of many of these questions is close to zero to date.

We still do not have all the information about the country's real economic position. Lack of this data prevents us from accurately defining a specific set of stabilization measures that should be undertaken (each of them still has to be prepared).

Loss of time is irreparable, the situation is still deteriorating, and the planned stabilization measures are already inadequate. The population is losing trust both in reform and in authority.

Moreover, the attempt to combine the "500 days" program with the USSR Government program—which was what caused this time to be lost—was based on the premise that combining the best sections of the various programs would enable their shortcomings to be eliminated. But the two documents' incompatibility is not a matter of whim or pride on the part of their authors. The outward similarity of the proposed measures is deceptive. Their common goal—the transition to the market—

is no guarantee of a successful fusion. The programs enshrined different logic, and the similarity of their words conceals varying content. A choice had to be made.

Second, the "500 days" program was based on recognition of the republics' state sovereignty. At the same time their perception of the commonality of their problems and aims gave them an opportunity to enter into an economic alliance to implement reform together. An accord was secured on this score in August with experts representing all republics (except Estonia)—they manifested readiness to abandon the protectionist policy which destroys the all-Union market, the introduction of their own currencies, the shareout of state property, and so on.

Unfortunately, having failed to adopt either of the proposed programs, the USSR Supreme Soviet handed them over to the republics for examination; as might have been expected, they did not manifest unanimity: Some republics favored one program, others favored the other, while a third group are elaborating their own plans for reform.

The opportunity to rapidly enter into an economic alliance was lost, yet this idea was one of the main achievements of the "500 days" program. What is more, we are now observing a deterioration in relations between the republics brought about by their uncoordinated actions (retail and purchase price hikes in Estonia and Russia respectively, export quotas in the Ukraine, a system of restrictions in Belorussia, and so on). This process will grow and even now it would be harder to conclude an economic agreement—if one were prepared—than two months ago. The single all-Union market is in jeopardy. No multilateral talks are under way on the most pressing economic issues, and it is not even known whether they are in preparation. Failure to resolve key problems is compelling the country's republics and regions, cities and individual areas to seek their own ways. Lack of agreement on the choice of an action plan increases many times over the likelihood of paralysis of power. Energy is expended not on construction but on confrontation.

Third, a number of steps have been taken of late in the sphere of pricing which have considerably complicated the situation and made the implementation of the actual intention of the "500 days" program impossible.

The Union government decided in May without sufficient grounds to increase (as of 1 July) grain purchase prices, increasing the budget deficit by 9 billion rubles [R]. This was the start of the implementation of the government's planned administrative price hike.

We proceeded on the premise that it is still possible to coordinate grain purchase prices with prices for other goods during the transition to contract prices and thus to avoid increasing the budget deficit. As was to be expected, the increase in prices did not bring about a marked increase in grain sales to the state. Given the

depreciating ruble and the all-around shortages, pumping extra money into agriculture undermines its market capability, especially since kolkhoz and sovkhoz [collective and state farms] debts of more than R70 billion were written off this summer. Following this the RSFSR government increased meat purchase prices, also without good cause, in September.

This decision was partially brought about by the USSR Council of Ministers promise to increase meat purchase prices as of 1 January 1991, after which meat sales to the state began to drop—why sell now if prices will double in four or five months? In our view, the worst possible option was chosen in these conditions, being the most at variance with the "500 days" program. This step was taken without coordination with the other republics and gave rise to an answering reaction: Purchase prices were increased throughout the country as of 1 October. The government reform took another step: Prices were increased for basic agricultural products on which the level of food retail prices depends.

Finally, government reform of wholesale prices was effectively implemented by a decree of 4 October. When concluding contracts enterprises are instructed to follow USSR State Committee for Prices price lists that were drawn up in line with decisions adopted in 1988 and conveyed to economic units this spring.

At the same time, after voting in favor of the "500 days" program, people in Russia gave tacit approval to the increase in purchase prices and adopted on the first reading the Law on Pensions, which even exceeds the calculations of the government of N. Ryzhkov, who preferred not to immediately embark on the vast expenditure involved in this and delayed this law's entry into force for two years. Russian legislators decided to enact it in full, failing to consider the economic consequences of this decision. The prognosis is easy: Literally six months after the enactment of this law the republic's entire population (including retirees themselves) will have a worse life as a result of inflation or the introduction of a general rationing system. You cannot provide something that does not exist, even given a very great desire to do so.

Let us sum up. A range of uncoordinated measures have transferred the development of events to a fundamentally different plane: The key element in the USSR Government program—the reform of all types of prices—has effectively been accepted. The logic of action proposed in the "500 days" program—beginning with financial recovery—has been rejected. The transition to market relations will not now occur via the stabilization of the ruble but via inflation and belated steps to overcome it, which will prove extremely painful.

The "Basic Guidelines..." finally adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet are not a practical plan for reform, but the general outline of such a plan.

The question of the need for coordinated concrete actions on the part of the republics and regions, the unity

of the plan, and the question of synchronizing the dates for the implementation of reform remains open. This will, of course, give both republics and the center some freedom, but this is also dangerous: A highly diverse line of concrete action may be chosen, going beyond the implementation of the "500 days" program alone. The logic of a completely different program will be implemented—if at all possible—under cover of some of its wordings.

Given the planned measures, the task set in the "Basic Guidelines..." of reducing the budget deficit in 1991 to R25-35 billion is totally unfeasible. The deficit will top this figure in the first quarter.

The interim option for economic reform which is in effect being implemented today will unequivocally take on the shape of the government program if there is a general retail price increase over the next few months with compensation as promised by the Union government's May program, which remained unratified. That is the way to hyperinflation.

The future may show that the majority of the measures envisaged in the "500 days" program still have to be implemented—the objective logic behind the development of events and the experience of many countries of the world indicate this. It retains its significance as a plan for consistent radical reform. However, although its purpose remains the same, the economic stabilization stage will be different in terms of its measures. The population's standard of living will drop considerably prior to stabilization. In that situation any program necessarily becomes tougher—the initial conditions for reform are changing too drastically, inflation is spiralling and the breakdown of the consumer market is increasing too rapidly, and the economy is moving further and further away from equilibrium. This will be the price that we pay for our indecisive, inconsistent choice of a path in September 1990.

[Signed] S. Shatalin, N. Petrakov, G. Yavlinskiy, S. Aleksashenko, A. Vavilov, L. Grigoryev, M. Zadornov, V. Martynov, V. Mashchits, A. Mikhaylov, B. Fedorov, T. Yarygina, Ye. Yasin.

Conference Held To Establish Moscow Stock Market

PM0511141790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Telephone, Teletype, Fax"]

[Text] Moscow—A stock market will be set up in the capital. This was announced at a press conference yesterday by Eduard Tenyakov, president of the "Fininvest" securities operations joint-stock investment finance company. A conference will be held in the capital 11 through 14 November at which it is proposed to set up an association of stock market members, a stock exchange, the "Inforynok" society to provide information support to the market, and an association of stock

market professionals. It is planned that the exchange will be a company in which each share (a seat on the exchange) will cost 500,000 rubles.

'Industrial Smuggling' Trial Ends With Acquittal

LD0511143190 Moscow World Service in English
1200 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] The hearing in Moscow of the first criminal case of industrial smuggling has ended with the defendant, Boris Korovitchkin, being acquitted and released from custody in the courtroom. He is the general director of the conversion concern and was accused by investigators of the KGB of illegally shipping out a huge consignment of fodder minerals. The court did not find anything criminal in his actions.

Mr. Korovitchkin's lawyer believes the conservative-minded forces want to use the case and set a precedent making it possible to consider many foreign trade deals as crimes.

Aviation Business Center Set Up in Moscow

LD0211222490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 2 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] An aviation business center has been set up in Moscow by the Ilyushin Design Bureau and the U.S. firm Satra Aerospace. Equipped with satellite communications, it will allow direct contacts between Western and Soviet aircraft builders and help the Soviet industry to exploit the latest aircraft models more rapidly. Investment should allow the Soviet aircraft industry to improve the quality of its aircraft and make them more competitive. Jeffrey Barrie, president of Satra Aerospace, explains that the expectation is that there will be a turnover of \$700 billion in the next 15 years from aircraft construction for the world market. His firm believes some of that amount will emanate from the Soviet Union and more specifically from the Business Center.

G.V. Novozhilov, general designer, says Ilyushin intends to fit its aeroplanes with an American engine. He has high hopes for the business center.

Ministry Bureaucracy Blocks Cambodian Trade Deal

PM3110144390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Kabannikov: "We Have Perestroika, and You Have the Timber"]

[Text] Phnom Penh—Imagine you were offered half a million dollars, without any conditions, in payment for some services rendered in the past. And you knit your brows in annoyance and stubbornly refuse, stating that you could not be bothered acknowledging such a trifle.

Yet something of the kind is actually happening in Soviet-Cambodian economic relations. The actual situation is that Cambodia is prepared to supply us with 5,000 cubic meters of hard wood. The timber will be used to pay off the 800-million [currency unspecified] Cambodian debt—that is, we will not need to pay a single kopek for it today. We have no equipment in our country capable of processing this timber. That is why it is proposed to reexport it. A buyer has been found in Japan. He will willingly pay some \$100 per cubic meter of timber, which will cost us slightly more than 100 rubles. We have also found a vessel to ship the timber, we could obtain another 100,000 in hard currency from the Japanese in freight charges. So what is the problem? After all, it only needs a high-ranking signature to seal the deal and name the bank account into which the dollars are to be paid.

But it is this last formal action that has kept people here waiting for approximately a year. And it is still not clear how things will end. Our trade representatives in Cambodia are in a stupid position. It is extremely hard for them to explain to their confused partners that we have a USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry and that it contains an organization called "Eksportles," which does not include round timber in its plans. And, as is well known, in our country the plan is the law. It is the immovable object on which all the desperate appeals to the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the government, and Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Comrade Gusev personally have foundered.

The situation is quite typical, since the small country's partner is a giant department with its own internal interests and tendency toward the universal scale. For several months now the Cambodians have been trying to sell us 700,000 pairs of beach shoes. Not the deal of the century, obviously. But we do not have such shoes. They are made out of crude rubber, cost a ruble a pair, and would also go toward clearing the debt. Such goods would be any cooperative member's dream. The Ministry of Trade, concerned about how to provide us with shoes on a statewide scale, does not need these slippers.

A few years ago the Khmers proposed paying their debts in good Virginia tobacco, which they grow. "We neither smoke nor drink"—that, basically, was the response from V. Murakhovskiy, then chairman of the USSR Agroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee]. To be fair, it should be noted that there really was concern for a healthy way of life. For a long time, the USSR Ministry of Health's Fourth Administration bought rice without chemical additives in Cambodia. As for tobacco, today we are prepared to buy any cigarettes here. But our partners shrug their shoulders: Since there is no strategy, the opportunities for immediate contracts are limited.

"But could we not give this timber that the ministry does not need to a really enterprising person?" I asked V.P. Yemelyanov, our trade representative in Cambodia.

There was a hidden meaning to the question, since the opinion still prevails that the state is still concerned—albeit only just—about our foreign economic interests. But if entrepreneurs were allowed in they would just line their pockets.

"Go ahead and take it," Viktor Petrovich replied half-ironically. "Try to obtain the right to some of the Cambodian debt, and then act."

Trade Union Congress Forms General Confederation 914F0026A Moscow TRUD in Russian 27 Oct 90 p 1

["Declaration on the Formation of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR"—TRUD headline]

[Text] Expressing the will and aspiration of the working people to consolidation and the unification of their efforts and actions,

aware of the unions' responsibility in the defense of their rights and interests,

proceeding from the fact that the trade union movement in our country has to a considerable extent exhausted the possibilities of the old structures and renouncing inordinate centralization fettering the initiative and independence of the trade union organizations and authorities and

recognizing the need for the unions' unification on a new, democratic basis,

the 19th USSR Trade Unions Congress proclaims the formation of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR.

Trade unions of the country, all-Union trade union federations and federations and other associations of trade unions of the Union republics and autonomous republics may join the confederation on a voluntary basis. It is also open to other trade union formations of working people and trainee youth recognizing its aims and tasks.

The confederation declares its independence of the organs of state and economic administration and political and public organizations and operates within the framework of the USSR Constitution, respecting the principles enshrined in the General Declaration of Human Rights and other international pacts of the United Nations on human rights and conventions of the International Labor Organization.

The confederation sets as its main task consolidation of the forces and coordination of the actions of the Soviet trade unions in the realization and defense of the labor, social, economic and spiritual rights and interests of the working people, trainee youth and retirees. To this end, it intends to make extensive use of the right of legislative initiative in the highest organs of state power and other media provided for by legislation. The confederation

will contribute by its entire activity to the formation of a state based on the rule of law on a foundation of democracy and social justice.

Abiding by the international traditions of the Soviet trade unions, the confederation will cooperate with national trade union associations and international trade union organizations for the purpose of the more effective defense of the interests of the working people, peace and democracy.

The confederation guarantees member organizations:

representation and defense of their interests in the state organs of power and administration;

the utmost support and solidarity in the championing of the rights and interests of the working people, including material assistance in special situations;

organizational and financial independence in accordance with their statutes and programs;

equal rights upon the discussion and solution of all questions of the confederation's activity and the right to express a particular opinion;

unrestricted withdrawal from the confederation.

Joining the confederation voluntarily, each member organization proceeds from the fact that our alliance is geared to the preservation and consolidation of the unity of the country's trade union movement and undertakes to act in accordance with this declaration and the statutes of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR.

Further on Trade Union Decisions

914F0026B Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Oct 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Day Five"]

[Text] The 19th USSR Trade Unions Congress continued yesterday in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At the morning session the delegates completed their discussion and adopted the statutes of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR.

Regulations Governing the Auditing Commission of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR were then adopted.

The congress confirmed the authority of the members of the VKP [General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR] delegated from sectoral unions and unions of the autonomous and union republics.

In accordance with the results of the ballot, V.P. Shcherbakov was elected chairman of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR.

The congress confirmed the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR Auditing Commission.

Deputy chairmen of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR were elected at the congress. In accordance with the results of the ballot, these were G.S. Bashtanyuk and V.V. Kuzmenok.

The congress adopted "Guidelines for the Actions of the USSR Trade Unions for the Immediate Period and the Long Term."

The congress adopted the following decisions: "Impermissibility of Legislative Restrictions on the Rights of Trade Unions"; "Report of the Group of Congress Delegates on the Work on the Draft Law of the USSR 'The Trade Unions, Their Rights and Guarantees of Activity' in Conjunction With the USSR Supreme Soviet Labor, Prices and Social Policy Commission"; "Property of Unions of the USSR"; "Protection of the USSR Population Against the Effect of the Consequences of the Chernobyl Catastrophe"; "Improvement of the System of Social Insurance in the USSR"; "Second Stage of the Congress"; "The Newspaper TRUD."

The congress passed the following resolutions: "The Unions' Positions on Strengthening of the Working People's Health"; "Labor Safety"; "The Unions' Youth Policy."

The following appeals of the 19th USSR Trade Unions Congress were adopted at the congress: "To All Working People, Trade Union Organizations and Public Environmental Movements of the Country"; "Rescue of Aral and Protection of the Population of the Aral Area Against the Consequences of the Ecological Catastrophe"; "To Trade Union and Workers Movements and Trade Union Centers of the Country on Unity and Consolidation of the Union and Workers Movement at the Current Stage"; appeals to the president of the USSR and the country's leadership on the state of agriculture and the position of people working in education.

The congress delegates adopted the following statements: "The Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range"; "Increased Socioeconomic Protection of Invalid Trade Union Members"; "Transition to Market Relations in the Housing Sphere"; "Defense of the Working People's Spiritual Interests and the Unions' Cultural Policy"; "Interethnic Conflicts in the Country."

The congress adopted a message to the world trade union movement.

This concluded the first stage of the congress. Its second stage will be held in 1991.

REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE RESOLVED TO JOIN THE COUNTRY'S NEW TRADE UNION CENTER SIGNED THE DECLARATION ON THE FORMATION OF THE GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS OF THE USSR.

Stroyev Addresses Peasant, Collective Farm Groups

914B0023A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
21 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[S. Chudakov report: "Is the Peasant Market Necessary? A Joint Plenum of the USSR Peasants' Union Central Council and the Union Kolkhoz Council"]

[Text] As SELSKAYA ZHIZN has already reported, a joint USSR Peasants' Union Central Council and the Union Kolkhoz [Collective Farm] Council has taken place in Moscow. Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases B.I. Poshkus presented a report entitled "A Program for Stabilizing the Economy and Switching to the Market Within the Agro-Industrial Complex." Those present at the plenum elected the Peasants' Union Central Council as the Presidium and confirmed its commissions.

In answer to the question of whether a peasants' market is needed, those attending the plenum responded unambiguously that it is. Moreover, a countryside needs a market as it needs air because it is only in that market that a true price can be set for farm and livestock farming produce. Previous methods of regulating prices that do not take account of the actual costs incurred by the corn grower and cover his labor led to impoverishment and ruin for the countryside and the mass departure of hereditary peasants. By its very nature agro-industrial production is best suited to market relations.

Those attending the meeting, however, emphasized that the peasants themselves must make the choice of forms of farming, ownership and disposal of the land, and the marketing of their output, and their way of life.

Radical restructuring of production relations in the countryside should be done on the basis of laws on land, ownership, leasing, and equal economic conditions for all forms of farming. All those who spoke were in agreement in this, and they see in this the guarantee for successful development of market relations. However, the views of those who drew up the program and of those attending the plenum concerning some fundamental propositions differed in a basic way. This applies first and foremost to the question of land ownership.

The question of attitude toward disposition of land should be considered by a referendum of the peasants. The proposition that tenure of land in a number of republics should be transformed into a right of ownership of the land was decisively rejected. Recognizing that the right of a peasant to leave a collective farm should be guaranteed, those present at the plenum expressed the opinion that dividing up parcels of land should be done giving due consideration to the need to create equal conditions for farming for both the collective and the person who quits the collective in accordance with the Fundamental Law on Land. And this precise procedure should also be defined for the case in which particular kolkhozes are split up.

It was also proposed that the country's leadership be informed that the program does not create equal starting conditions for the city and the countryside for entering the market.

The chairman of the "Gorshikha" Kolkhoz in Yaroslavskiy Rayon, Yaroslavl Oblast, V.V. Tamarov, noted that for the people of Yaroslavl the provision in the program that strengthens "motivation for peasant labor and socioeconomic guarantees for a fair position for the peasantry in society" under market relations is ridiculous. For in these past years material-technical supplies for the countryside have been reduced almost to zero: Of the 136 million tonnes of cement for this year, only 17 million have been received. So how is the program going to stabilize the rural economy and insure the inclusion of the agro-industrial complex in the market system if it proposes that urgent measures "to insure that material-technical supplies for agriculture are at a level no lower than for 1989-1990?" The impression is being created that the authors of the program are not only unaware of real life, but also have failed to listen either to the appeal to the First USSR Congress of People's Deputies issued by 417 agrarian deputies, or to the statement issued by the Constituent Congress of the USSR Peasants' Union to the country's leadership and the submitted to it, which at item No. 31 sets forth the urgent measures needed to revitalize the peasantry and provide economic, social, and legal safeguards for it. Only if these are included in the program will it be possible to switch to the market, those attending the plenum said.

In the opinion of the chairman of "Godovshchina Otyabyra" Kolkhoz in Kuytunskiy Rayon, Irkutsk Oblast, A.N. Borodavkin, the program that has been submitted is a declaration of war on the peasant collectives that are somehow managing to feed the country today, instead of a recognition of their equal rights with farmers, leaseholders, and the people in cooperatives. He supported the demand of preceding speakers to check on fulfillment by the country's leadership of the demands of the USSR Peasants' Union, taking into account equal development of all kinds of farming, and to convene an extraordinary congress of the Union not in the summer, as had been planned initially by the Constituent Congress, but in November or December, before discussion at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the agrarian program for the switch to the market. This kind of approach can perhaps be written into the resolution only if real priority is given to the countryside for the entire upcoming five-year plan. And director of the Lidskiy Diary-and-Canning Combine in Grodno Oblast, V.G. Chernykh, and the chairman of the Peasants' Union of the Ukraine, I.A. Mozgovoy, believe that this priority should be guaranteed by an appropriate law.

"We in the Ukraine have already passed a republic law on priority development for the countryside," I.A. Mozgovoy reported, and he expressed the hope that the country's legislators will follow that example. Noting the constructive nature of the plenum discussion on the

question of the switch to the market in the agro-industrial complex, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev agreed that there are many weak points in the programs that have been proposed. Particular sections of them require major reworking. But there are questions whose resolution cannot be postponed. They include stabilization of the financial and monetary system, stabilization of the consumer market, dealing with the debauch of speculation and organized crime, and national conflicts. And finally, stabilization of production ties and the restoration of normal operations at enterprises. And Communists, including members of your Peasants' Union, are doing everything possible to this end.

It would be a blasphemy both to the peasants and to history, Ye.S. Stroyev continued, "to think that the market can save the countryside without goal-oriented capital investments. I know from my own experience that no amount of money and no amount of material resources can help many farms. People will go to those farms only when they build new housing and create proper social conditions. Only then will it be possible to revitalize the countryside.

As far as material-technical supplies for agriculture are concerned, next year it will be necessary to set the task of not only maintaining volumes, particularly in the social sphere, but also of sharply increasing them by means of reducing costs in other sectors. Otherwise even the best forms of farming, which are being so hotly debated, will not help.

In concluding his statement, Ye.S. Stroyev emphasized that entry into the market requires capable production organizers. Where can we get them? Since the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum it has been possible to establish an enormous group of experts with higher and secondary agricultural education, who have now become firmly established and have worked for many years. This is our country's greatest wealth. And we must handle the disposition of that wealth with skill.

Summing up the results of the discussion of the question of the switch to the market, Chairman of the USSR Peasants' Union V.A. Starodubtsev said that the peasants cannot stop the processes now taking place in the country that are unfavorable for the agro-industrial complex. But we can make relations between the city and the countryside more sensible and honorable. We cannot permit schemes to be foisted onto the peasants without even asking them. V.A. Starodubtsev sees the solution to the crisis in civic consensus and mutually advantageous cooperation between the peasants and the working class and all strata of society. In the struggle against destructive forces, he called for a firm stand on the positions drawn by the plenum, and government compliance with the Union's demands set forth in the "List" attached to the Statement to the country's leaders. After the plenum

had ended, we asked CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.S. Stroyev to give his appraisal of some of the statements.

"As is known, at their congress the founders of the Peasants' Union announced their firm desire to assist the country's Communist Party in stabilizing the economy and in achieving the aims and tasks of the perestroika initiated by our party. But today it seemed to me that faint notes of confrontation were sounded. [no closing quotation marks as published]

Yes, there are elements of confrontation in the opinions of many of the speakers, who are thus expressing their justified dissatisfaction with the situation that has taken shape in the agrarian complex before the switch to the market. Pluralism of opinion enables everyone to express his own opinion. On the whole, the speeches showed knowledge of the matter at hand, and of the mechanism of the market economy. But there were also some that testified to a poor understanding of the program.

The plenum unanimously decided to send a letter to the president of the USSR and the country's government, demanding initiation of urgent measures to revitalize the peasantry and provide economic, social, and legal safeguards for it in the presidential program for the switch to the market. In the event that the issues raised by the Constituent Congress of the USSR Peasants' Union are not reviewed by them, the plenum deems it necessary to engage in collective action to defend the interests of the peasants in accordance with the Rules of the USSR Peasants' Union.

Agricultural

End-October Weather, Crop Status Report

PM0511152590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 6 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[Agrometeorologist T. Rossinskaya report dated 2 November: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] The weather on the USSR's European territory was unstable in the last third of October. In the Northern, Volga-Vyatka, and Ural Regions precipitation fell for four to six days as rain and snow. Toward the end of the period a snow cover was established in the fields. Over most of the territory of the Ukraine and of the Central Chernozem, Central, and Volga Regions and in Belorussia and the Baltic republics precipitation during one or two days and, in places, three days made it difficult to complete the harvesting of late agricultural crops and to carry out the fall plowing. Because of the rain that fell during the preceding period the upper layer of soil remained waterlogged (particularly on heavy loams)—which created unfavorable conditions for the work of agricultural machinery.

In the Northern and Ural Regions and the north of the Volga-Vyatka Region winter grain crops and perennial grasses were in a state of winter rest beneath a snow cover whose depth ranged between two and 14 cm. The minimum soil temperature at tillering node depth for winter grain crops ranged between zero and minus five degrees. Conditions for the start of the wintering and hardening of winter crops were satisfactory.

In the Baltic republics, Belorussia, the Northwest and Central Regions, and also the south of the Volga-Vyatka Region and the north of the Volga and Central Chernozem Regions weak growth of winter crops was observed only on individual days, when the air temperature was between nine and 12 degrees.

In the north of the Ukraine and over most of the territory of the North Caucasus Region, where winter grain crops were growing, the supply of moisture for crops was adequate (20-25 mm of productive moisture in the tilled layer of the soil). Winter crops sown before 20 September had fully tillered.

In Moldova [Moldavia], southern oblasts of the Ukraine, and also in places in Rostov and Volgograd Oblasts, in Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, and in the majority of rayons of the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and Astrakhan Oblast there was still inadequate moisture in the tilled layer of the soil (10-15 mm of productive moisture and, in places, less than five mm). Winter crops there were at the seedling and third-leaf stages.

In West Siberia winter grain crops were in a state of winter rest beneath a light snow cover (between one and four cm).

Conditions for the growth and development of winter grain crops in the Transcaucasian republics were favorable.

Over most of the territory of the Central Asian republics and southern Kazakhstan the harvesting of cotton and other late agricultural crops was taking place under favorable conditions. Only in Kirghizia, eastern Uzbekistan, and southeastern Kazakhstan were conditions unfavorable for field work because of rain which fell for three to five days.

Harvest Conclusion, Sowing Shortfall Detailed

PM0411143590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 3 Nov 90 p 1

[N. Osychkin report under the rubric "USSR State Committee for Food Operational Figures": "Concluding Field Work"]

[Text] Harvest work on the country's kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] has entered its concluding phase. As of 29 October the gross grain harvest (including corn) on all categories of farms stood at 233 million tonnes—25 million tonnes higher than

1989. An average of 22 quintals of grain crops has been obtained from each hectare.

Grain cereals still remain to be threshed on 500,000 hectares. During the past week they have been harvested on 276,000 hectares. Grain corn has been harvested on 1,650,000 hectares—42 percent of the sown area. Some 36.9 quintals of grain have been harvested per hectare, and 6.1 million tonnes have been threshed. Corn remains to be harvested on 813,000 hectares, including 322,000 hectares on RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] farms and 387,000 hectares on Ukrainian farms.

Some 65.8 million tonnes of grain—76 percent of the state order—have been received by state stocks (taking account of loan repayments). Farms have sold 6.1 million tonnes of grain over and above contract levels in order to cover reciprocal sales of scarce material and technical resources. In the week under review 985,000 tonnes of grain—244,000 tonnes less than the previous week—were sold to the state. Some 2,636,000 tonnes of high-grade grain seeds—66 percent of the plan figure—have been procured, including 294,500 tonnes of winter crop seeds (79 percent of the plan figure) and 2,341,000 tonnes of spring seeds (64 percent of the plan figure). This work should be continued in order to ensure that state stocks, and kolkhoz and sovkhoz granaries receive adequate amounts of high-quality seeds with a reserve for the entire spring sowing area.

Sunflowers have been threshed on 3,496,000 hectares—78 percent of the sown area. The yield has been 16.1 quintals. Oilseed sili has to be harvested on 1,015,000 hectares. In all, 4,458,000 tonnes of oil-bearing crops have been purchased—70 percent of the contract figure and 1,347,000 tonnes less than at the same time last year. This total includes 3,750,000 tonnes of sunflowers (68 percent of the state order) and 253,000 tonnes of soybean (70 percent of the state order). Some 276,000 tonnes of rape, or 74,000 tonnes more than 1989, have been purchased, and the corresponding figures for mustard are 154,000 tonnes, or 38,000 tonnes more than last year.

According to operational figures for 29 October, 8,059,000 tonnes of raw cotton—102.3 percent of the plan—have been purchased. All oblasts in the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] have fulfilled the state order (104.9 percent), as have all oblasts in the Kazakh SSR (103.2 percent), the Kirghiz SSR (113.8 percent), and the Turkmen SSR (106.2 percent). The harvest has been worse than last year in the Azerbaijan and Tajik SSR's. In those republics the plan for cotton purchases has been 89.6 percent fulfilled. Cotton-harvesting machines have harvested 4,652,000 tonnes of raw cotton, or 58 percent of the total harvest. Some 1,010,000 tonnes of fine-fiber cotton—95 percent of the plan figure—have been purchased. This is 241,000 tonnes more than last year. Cotton harvesting and procurement are continuing.

Long-stemmed flax has been harvested on 553,000 hectares—71 percent of the sown area. Sugar beet has been harvested on 2.9 million hectares—87 percent of the sown area. More than 3.7 million tonnes of sugar—somewhat more than last year—have been produced at plants.

Work in truck gardens needs to be completed. Vegetables have been harvested on 861,000 hectares—83 percent of the sown area—and the gross harvest has been 13.6 million tonnes. Some 158 quintals of vegetables have been harvested per hectare. On kolkhozes and sovkhozes potatoes have been lifted on 2,028,000 hectares—90 percent of the planted area. Tubers still have to be harvested on 128,000 hectares. Yields have been 104 quintals per hectare. In most places the weather is allowing this work to proceed. All the potatoes still in the ground should be lifted and delivered to consumers.

Winter sowing is nearly finished. Winter crops have been sown on 33.4 million hectares. Fall plowland has been plowed on 73.8 million hectares. The failure to carry out sowing on considerable winter-crop areas and the inadequate preparation of fall plowland are presenting farm leaders and agronomists with a serious question: What will have to be done in order to prevent a shortfall in the amount of grain and other crops next year?

Agricultural Highlights for 28 Oct-3 Nov Reviewed

LD0411012490

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian from 28 October to 3 November. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

28 October - 1 November

No significant developments reported.

2 November

Over 3 million tonnes of sugarbeet have been dispatched for processing by Kursk Oblast crop growers. Some 1 million tonnes still remain in the fields. (0200)

3 November

No significant developments reported.

Scientific

Communications Satellite Launched 3 Nov

LD0511091490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 5 Nov (TASS)—In accordance with the program for the further development of communications systems and television broadcasting by means of artificial earth satellites, on 3 November 1990 the launch of

another "Gorizont" communications satellite was carried out by a "Proton" carrier rocket in the Soviet Union.

The satellite has been placed in a near-stationary orbit with the following parameters: distance from the earth's surface—35,688km; period of revolution—23 hours 51 minutes; orbital inclination—1.4 degrees.

The apparatus installed on the "Gorizont" satellite is working normally. The command and measuring complex is monitoring the satellite. The satellite's communications and television apparatus will be used in accordance with the planned program.

Cosmonauts Begin Fourth Month in Space

LD0211144190 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov have begun their fourth month of work in space.

This week's plans included, in addition to operations outside the space station, material research in weightlessness and astrophysical observations.

The Gallar installation was used to melt materials to obtain monocrystals of semi-conducting Gallium Arsenide.

The magnetic spectrometer Maria helped in a series of experiments aimed at studying the mechanism of elementary high energy particles generation and their proliferation in near-earth space.

Today, Manakov and Strekalov undergo medical tests, which include being weighed, testing muscle strength after three months in space, blood analysis and audio tests.

During one of the communications sessions, a space television bridge was established, linking the Mission Control Centre, the space station and Tokyo. Cosmonaut Training Centre Chief Lieutenant-General Shatalov introduced the Soviet-Japanese crews now going through the final stage of preparation for a space mission—Soviet cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev, Musa Manarov, Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev and Japanese journalists Toehiro Akiyama and Reko Kikuti.

Soviet-Canadian Meeting on Space Biology Ends

LD0511064790 Moscow TASS in English 0629 GMT 5 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa November 5 TASS—Mutual benefits of cooperation and good prospects for its development were pointed out by participants in the first meeting of the Soviet-Canadian working group on space biology and medicine.

The results of two joint experiments on the Soviet biology satellite Cosmos-2044 last year were summed up for the session which was held in Ottawa and Montreal from October 30 to November 5.

The Soviet delegation acquainted the Canadians with a programme for research by means of yet another biosatellite which is to be launched next year and invited the Canadians to participate in the programme.

The two countries' scientists decided to concentrate their joint efforts on four areas of space biology and medicine: neurovestibular physiology, metabolism, radiation dosimetry, and gravitational biology.

The working group's two co-chairmen—Cosmonaut Valeri Polyakov, deputy director of the Institute of Medico-Biological Problems, and Allan Mortimer, head of the Biology and Medicine Department of the Canadian Space agency—regard the research in these problem areas as extremely important for preparing space flights that would last for years.

Charity Project Urges SRV-USSR Cooperation

91P50026A

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 27 October 1990 in its Second Edition publishes on page 4 a 1,100-word article on the progress of "Operation Coconut," a charity project initiated by PRAVDA and the Vietnamese newspaper NHAN DAN to help Chernobyl victims combat the harmful effects of contamination by radioactive nuclides. Written by PRAVDA correspondent M. Domogatskikh, the article is entitled "Next Step—Business!" and describes Vietnamese efforts to collect and process coconut husks for the production of activated carbon for use in medicine prepared in the Soviet Union. Ten tons of the activated carbon were shipped to the USSR on 30 September and another seven tons are expected to arrive by 7 November, in time for the anniversary of the Russian revolution.

Tran Kien, assistant editor-in-chief of NHAN DAN, who is in charge of overseeing "Operation Coconut," notes that the project's initial humanitarian and charitable stage has concluded. From the standpoints of efficiency and timeliness he proposes undertaking the manufacture of the medicine itself through joint enterprises. He states: "Now is the time to turn to the wide road of practical matters. Let us approach in earnest the creation of joint enterprises not simply for the making of activated carbon, but for the preparation itself. This will immediately resolve many problems in terms of both production and transportation." Tran Kien goes on to indicate that the medicine could be rapidly conveyed to the USSR by air transport, as well as exported for profit to pharmaceutical companies on the international market.

Scientist Urges Cooperation To Save Black Sea

LD3110220190 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT
31 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 31 TASS—Recent press reports, alleging that upward currents of water rich in harmful hydrogen sulphide make the Black Sea surface layers very volatile, are without ground, leading Soviet oceanographer Mikhail Vinogradov told TASS.

Thorough research during the past two years have revealed nothing like what the press would like people to believe, he said.

However, there are enough other reasons for worry: the critical state of the Soviet Odessa Bay and the Bulgarian Burgas Bay is very close to ecological disaster. The crisis is caused mainly by pollutants carried by a number of rivers flowing through vast territories of many European countries. The Danube, for instance, flows through eight countries on its way to the Black Sea and accounts for more than half of the total free water supplies to the Black Sea. Waste water discharges from factories, enterprises and cities are deadly poison to sea life, Vinogradov said.

As a result, the number of dolphins in the Black Sea has dropped from 2.5 million to 100,000. Harmful microorganisms proliferate in the coastal areas, making water quality deteriorate dramatically and numerous beaches unsuitable to bathers and swimmers.

Fish stocks have been depleted in the Black Sea and nearly completely exterminated in the Sea of Azov by the new swarming predator—meduse-like "grebnevik". The total mass of these organisms has reached nearly one billion tonnes. The Black Sea's northwest shelf is almost bare of useful water plants which used to be processed to obtain preparations capable of removing radiation particles from the human organism.

It is now clear, Vinogradov said, that no country is capable of solving all the problems plaguing the Black Sea on its own. This is why talks are under way to conclude an government convention to protect its waters. Vinogradov recalled that scientists from a number of European countries, who assembled at an ecological forum in October, adopted a declaration on the establishment of an international fund to rescue the Black Sea. "However, we need not only financial resources but also reconsidering our consumer approach to the sea," Vinogradov said.

Military

Procedure for Moscow Military Parade Outlined

PM0411171590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 4 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Chief of the Moscow City Garrison's Order of the Day No. 31, dated "2 November 1990, Moscow City Garrison": "On the 7 November 1990 Troop Parade"]

[Text] 1. A parade of troops from the Moscow Garrison will be held on Red Square in Moscow at 1000 hours on 7 November 1990 to mark the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The salute at the parade will be taken by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister. I will be in command of the parade.

2. Formation and unit commanders will send out guides and form up the troops for the parade in the arranged order at the appointed time. Full dress winter uniform will be worn with caps.

3. Major General G.D. Bashkin, commander of the Moscow Kremlin, will fire an artillery salute as prescribed by his orders.

4. Lieutenant General N.N. Smirnov, Moscow city military commander, is charged with overall responsibility for maintaining order in Red Square.

[Signed] Colonel General N. Kalinin, chief of the Moscow City Garrison and commander of the Order of Lenin Moscow Military District

Protesters Disrupt Tanks' Parade Practice

91UM0069A Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 31 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by F. Semyanovskiy: "What Happened After All on Revolution Square"]

[Text] The mass media has already reported on the incident in Revolution Square associated with an attempt to obstruct the movement of a column of military parade participants.

Returning to this incident, our correspondent asked actual participants, with whom he met in the parade assembly area, to talk about it.

Guards Private Igor Kuznetsov, tank driver-mechanic:

"On Friday evening, 16 October, we had a planned practice in Red Square in preparation for the November parade. Our battalion was returning from there in a regular column of military vehicles. The lead vehicle was the tank of Major G. Bakanov, the battalion commander, and my tank was behind him. At about 2330 hours, we approached Revolution Square. People were standing on the sidewalks watching the movement of the military vehicles. However, there was no unfriendliness in their faces. And suddenly, on the square itself, three persons rushed toward my tank—two men and one woman. Apparently, realizing that I could not stop in time, they ran off to the side and headed for the third tank in our column. It was being operated by Private Aleksandr Pendyurin, a driver-mechanic second class."

Aleksandr Pendyurin:

"Reducing speed on approaching Revolution Square, I was separated from the tank ahead of me by about 15-20

meters. And suddenly three civilians appeared in front of me: two men and one woman. One of the men together with the woman moved to the side, but the other, spreading his arms, was yelling something. I had my tank helmet on and, in addition, the engine was running. So, I could not hear anything. There was no doubt about one thing: The person in front of the tank was drunk. I had to stop the tank..."

From the official investigation into the circumstances of the stopping of the tank column and the incident on Revolution Square, which was conducted by Colonel V. Kozlov.

Colonel V. Kozlov:

"On 26 October at about 2330, a column of military vehicles was returning after a practice on Sadovoye Koltso to the parade assembly area. At the start of Sadovo-Kudrinskaya Street, a group of civilians was standing at the pedestrian crossing near house No. 2. As it turned out subsequently, among them was Lev Shemayev, a member of the Coordinating Council of the Moscow Association of Voters, and Aleksandr Osovtshev, chairman of the Permanent Commission on Social Questions of the Moscow Soviet. This group came from Gertsen Street from the Central House of Men of Letters.

"After tank No. 14 was stopped, Osovtshev was approached by Major I.M. Kiryanov—an officer of the Moscow commandant's staff, and S.N. Trifonov, an official of the GAI [State Automobile Inspection], and they demanded that the vehicle lane be cleared.

"According to testimony of eyewitnesses of what transpired, citizen Osovtshev, who was in a state of intoxication and waving the ID of a people's deputy, refused to fulfill this demand, declared his personal immunity under the law, used obscene language, and called the officers of the militia and the commandant's staff 'dirty bolshevik swine, bolsheviks who should have been slaughtered, scoundrels, fascists, and Kremlin henchmen,' and he threatened to hang everyone in the near future.

"After arriving on the scene, Militia Lieutenant Colonel V.T. Murashov asked both of the citizens on the sidewalk, who were indignant over Osovtshev's behavior, to assist in clearing the vehicle lane. Citizen Osovtshev once again refused to leave, declaring that he was resting there and that he wanted to rest in the vehicle lane itself. By order of Colonel Bogdanov, first deputy military commandant of Moscow, Major Kiryanov, in order not to delay the column, gave the command to tank No. 14 to drive around the group. The tank began to move, but another citizen (L. Shemayev) rushed toward it. The tank stopped, and Shemayev laid down on the asphalt about five or six meters from the tank to prevent movement.

"The group of citizens around him (up to 10 persons) declared that they were also people's deputies, and one of the women said that the chief of the GUVD [Main

Administration of Internal Affairs] of the Moscow City executive committee is directly subordinate to her and that through him, she will find justice for everyone..."

These are the facts. The readers can themselves render a political assessment.

CPSU Commission on Military Policy Meets

*PM0511100990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "The Country's Defense: Strategy of Perestroika. Session of CPSU Central Committee Commission on the Party's Military Policy"]

[Text] The Communist Party's policy was and remains founded on the belief that the protection of the peaceful life of the country's peoples must remain as secure as possible. This idea was also highlighted at the 28th CPSU Congress, which, as is well known, felt it necessary to form a CPSU Central Committee Commission on the party's military policy. Its first session has now been held.

The basis of the commission's activity, O.D. Baklanov, commission chairman and secretary of the party Central Committee, said when opening the meeting, was defined in the 28th CPSU Congress resolution "On the basic guidelines of military policy at the present stage." In view of the diversity of the problems in this sphere, four working subcommissions have been formed—on questions of party support for the reform and further development of the USSR Armed Forces; on social provision and the legal protection of servicemen and members of their families; on questions of party support for military-technical policy and conversion; and on ties with state and social organizations and movements and the mass media.

Further work on the draft concept of the Armed Forces reform which the country's public is awaiting and the concrete steps to implement the defensive military doctrine based on the principle of reasonable sufficiency both require the consolidation of all forces, the high activeness of party organizations, and more purposeful political influence by the party on the life and development of the Soviet Armed Forces. Ways of implementing these urgent measures were discussed during an open and democratic debate.

Even the mere listing of the range of problems which the commission is to study together with its working organs generated a lively discussion whose participants voiced their observations based on their personal knowledge of the essence of the questions involved. Commission members stressed that there is deep concern at many of the questions connected with the military draft and that military-technical policy needs fundamentally new approaches.

None of the speeches overlooked the social problems connected with army and navy life which have become

particularly acute recently. The session had to state the harsh and grim facts that the legal norms of soldiers' life are lagging behind the changes taking place in society and that this lag is taking a particular toll given the attempts by certain forces to discredit the army and drive a wedge between the people and their scion—the USSR Armed Forces.

The commission regards as urgent priorities the solution of the housing problem facing officers and warrant officers and questions of job placement, education, and trade and medical services for their families. Everything must be done, the session stressed, to ensure that people in uniform feel a greater concern for them than before from a society which is carrying out the radical restructuring of all spheres of the country's life.

Many people today are demanding that conversion processes be accelerated. The commission paid this new phenomenon of our socioeconomic reality the attention commensurate with the problem's importance. On the basis of precise calculations, speakers argued that in parallel with the state conversion program, whose draft was examined at the Presidential Council at the end of September, there must also be specific plans for each enterprise which take its specific features into account and which must match the material and financial potential.

In these conditions the learning of new professions and trades by a large contingent of highly skilled production workers is assuming special importance. One of the basic tasks, the session noted, is to preserve the high defense potential and its scientific and technical base and to know how to integrate this powerful intellectual force in the country's economic and social system that is being renewed, especially in conditions of market relations, without allowing the level of that defense potential to decline.

Conversion is closely bound up with the dynamics and results of the talks on arms reduction now being held. That is why the depth of the conversion is directly dependent on the results of the talks with our partners. A national program for the creation and production of military hardware can also only be built on the basis of honest parity. A hasty unilateral reduction of the USSR Armed Forces' material base would be a fatal mistake which the people would never pardon, commission members noted.

The course toward openness, broad representation, and the fullest use of society's scientific potential was reflected in the question on the commission's advisers. The session set up a team of highly qualified specialists whom the commission plans to involve in permanent cooperation.

Closing the commission session, Baklanov stressed that it is going to be necessary to learn to work in the new conditions, to find more effective forms of work, and not supplant state and economic organs of management as

before but implement the party's line in the military sphere by political methods.

The fulfillment of the constitutional duties to defend the Soviet motherland was and remains one of the most important tasks facing the whole people, the party, and the state. Thus the CPSU Central Committee commission deemed it necessary to prepare a series of reports for submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet under the legislative initiative procedure.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Session

*PM0211142790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 First Edition p 1*

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev report: "Central Committee Commission Starts Work"]

[Text] The first sitting of the CPSU Central Committee commission on the party's military policy, held 29-30 October under the chairmanship of O.D. Baklanov, was devoted to questions of creating a viable mechanism for implementing the 28th congress resolution which outlined the basic directions of CPSU military policy in the current phase. And although this time the discussion was nominally concerned with defining areas of activity and tasks, the distribution of functions, the elaboration of a program, and a search for forms for the country's Communists to influence the solution of problems that are topical for the Armed Forces and the country's defense complex, it was unusually sharp, and even harsh.

The people who gathered in one of the rooms in the building on Staraya Square looked anything but blinkered or far removed from the realities of our time. They brought to the headquarters of their party the concerns and questions that are worrying their compatriots—Communists and nonparty people in various regions in the country—today.

The situation in the Army and sectors of industry that supply the Army is alarming, they believe. To this day there is no clear integral concept for maintaining the country's defense capability and security at the level of reliable and reasonable sufficiency in the conditions of the transition to the market. The prestige of military service is falling, drafts of the younger generation are failing, and attempts are being made to compartmentalize the Armed Forces on ethnic grounds. Another alarming fact is that well-organized economic ties are being broken, skilled cadres of production specialists are disintegrating, and social protection for those who are providing defense is becoming increasingly poor.

In these conditions, party organs that are being renewed and all Communists are called upon not to supplant legislative organs and the existing structures of power, but to help them and assist the changes that can be observed here by means of their own specific forms of work.

What does the commission intend to concern itself with? The main tasks and directions in its activity include a

whole complex of issues. These include the elaboration of basic principles of party backup for the reform of the USSR Armed Forces and their subsequent development to the year 2000, the preparation of materials on CPSU military policy during the elaboration of the new party program and the introduction of changes into the party statutes, the elaboration of a long-term party military policy in the sphere of providing the Army and Navy with modern weapons and military hardware, and the elaboration of proposals on the optimization of the staffing structure and organs of Armed Forces administration, the restructuring of cadre policy, and the democratization of service relationships.

The commission believes that one of its top priority tasks is the elaboration of draft laws on defense questions for submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the strengthening of the material and social position of military cadres.

The participants in the sitting confirmed that they are open to collaboration with the mass media and prepared for fruitful cooperation with other party and sociopolitical organizations operating in the country within the framework of the Soviet laws to implement CPSU military policy.

With the aim of giving concrete assistance to republic, kray, and oblast party committees [kraykoms and obkoms], and also to party organizations in the Armed Forces and enterprises in the defense sectors of industry, the sitting adopted a decision to form four subcommissions.

A decision was adopted to submit a memorandum to the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat on the question "On Urgent Measures in Connection With the Strengthening of Anti-Army Phenomena in a Number of Regions in the Country" so that it can be subsequently sent to the central committees of union republic communist parties and party kraykoms and obkoms.

In December the commission plans to examine the question of progress in the elaboration of the concept of military reform and the long-term development of the USSR Armed Forces and publish the material in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. In this way impetus will be given to party organizations in the Army and Navy and all Communists to become involved in the discussion of this problem and the study of ideas and proposals.

North Caucasus Allays Anxieties About Draft

*PM0511093590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 25 Oct 90 First Edition p 1*

[Interview with Major General V. Sein by Lieutenant Colonel N. Astashkin under the "Fall Draft" rubric: "To Understand One Another"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Many offices of the North Caucasus Military District political directorate are deserted today. Generals and other officers are on assignment in various regions: in Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, North Osetia, Kalmykia, Chechen-Ingushetia... They are all visiting enterprises, schools, secondary vocational and technical schools, and draftees' families themselves.

Why have political workers decided to resort to this form of contact with people? It was with that question that our permanent correspondent began his conversation with Major General V. Sein, chief of the district's political directorate.

[Astashkin] Vladimir Ivanovich, what aims are you pursuing here?

[Sein] Our task is to dispel parents' fears, describe the changes that are taking place in the Armed Forces, and tell them what awaits their sons when they don military uniform. Second, we are showing the changes taking place in military service and the measures that the government and the Defense Ministry are taking in soldiers' direct interests. And finally, we also visited draftees' families to get to know as much as possible about those people who will be joining the army if not now then in the near future.

[Astashkin] This is undoubtedly an interesting form of work. But political directorate officers alone cannot cope with all the draftees' families...

[Sein] Nor is that our intention. Political workers' main function is to organize such meetings. They set up around themselves large groups of officers who study the feelings of draftees and their parents. Who are the people in these groups? First and foremost, representatives of all the military commissariats—from the republic and kray level to the rayon level. Then chiefs of directorates and services and officers of the district staff. As you can see, they are highly qualified representatives. This, of course, produces results. We aim for direct contact with people in our work: When you can see the other guy's eyes it is easier to influence his heart and mind.

Let me give you the following example. In the past we restricted ourselves to holding meetings of soldiers' mothers at autonomous republic, kray, or oblast level alone. This, of course, yielded some benefit. However, we did not manage to influence all parents of servicemen or of draftees. Now we have decided to work at a lower level and stage such events in each rayon. That makes sense, of course. Judge for yourself. We choose a small site, people within a range of 20-30 km can come along and in an informal way clear up the many questions connected with the draft or the conditions of their sons' military service that interest them.

[Astashkin] Nowadays some mothers are increasingly frequently demanding that their sons do their military service near their homes. What is your position on that score?

[Sein] My position is quite clear: So long as our country has a Constitution and a law on compulsory military service we must strictly observe their requirements. At the same time, in human terms I understand those parents. Furthermore, I would say that our visits to the draftees' families highlight many problems. Here are a few situations. A son is going to join the Army, his parents are very old and there is no one to help them. Or a young man is called up for service and leaves a wife and child behind. We try to take such factors into account. As far as possible, we send such draftees to units nearby.

[Astashkin] One last question: What is the effect of this work?

[Sein] It is too soon to draw any "global" conclusion. The fall draft is in full swing. But one thing is beyond doubt: We have not had any refusals or blockading of military commissariats yet.

Shchit Official Defends Coup Charges

91UM0067A Moscow SOBESEDNİK in Russian
No 40, Oct 90 (signed to press 1 Oct 90) p 6

[Report on interview with reserve Colonel Vitaliy Urazhtsev, cochairman of Shchit and USSR people's deputy, by Mikhail Sokolov; place and date not given: "The Soldiers Went"]

[Text] A polemic developed in the legislature last week between KGB deputies and leaders on the one hand, and the Ministry of Defense on the other, concerning the strange troop movements in September around Moscow. D. Yazov stated that the information of Deputy S. Belozertsev, which he gleaned from the Shchit union, did not accord with what actually happened.

What kind of an organization is Shchit? Its leaders tell us that the basis for the union for social protection of military servicemen, individuals liable to be called into the military, and their families was laid in 1982. Its membership includes about 10,000 people. Up to 80 percent of them are "secret" members. The reason? Officers are expelled from the Army for participating in the activity of this organization. During the time the union has been in existence about a thousand officers have been expelled from the Army for political reasons. (Incidentally, young officers who were being refused discharges from the Army actively took advantage of this right after Shchit was created.) Now, as Shchit leaders report, the majority of members of the organization have entered its ranks in order to prevent the use of the Armed Forces, on orders from the partocracy, against the people themselves, to protect the rights and freedoms of military servicemen, and to rid the Army of "dedovshchina" [hazing] and corruption. Experts from the Shchit union have studied the circumstances surrounding the sending of troops into Baku, pointing out a number of crimes committed by military servicemen against peaceful people, and they are developing their own concept of military reform. We met with Vitaliy Urazhtsev, cochairman of Shchit, a USSR

people's deputy, and a reserve colonel, the day after the overthrow of Army General Yazov.[end italics]

[Urazhtsev] We are sticking to our guns, that was not training. The facts reported by Sergey Kudinov, chief of the political department of the Ryazan paratrooper school and a people's deputy of the Ryazan Oblast Soviet, are exactly in keeping with what happened. He has been a member of our organization for three years now, and we were forced to make Colonel Kudinov "go public" only because of the extraordinary situation that existed. The fact that troops and equipment were being diverted to Moscow is confirmed, for example, by the fliers of military aircraft, who right before 16 September transported units of the Pskov airborne division.

It is difficult to say anything about the reliability of Yazov's statement if he is wrong even in minor things: For example, the minister said Kudinov was a member of Democratic Russia even though he is still a member of the CPSU. Incidentally, they have already managed to remove Kudinov from his position, violating his status as a people's deputy... And the map that was shown to the deputies? I can draw you one like that overnight.

[Sokolov] Tell me, what was Colonel Kudinov to have done if they had taken his school to Moscow in order to take over power?

[Urazhtsev] He would simply have done everything he could to stop the transfer. If a decent officer is ordered to fire into a crowd of people, he should not do it. Incidentally, during the September "training" the Ryazan regiment, when moving toward Moscow, was halted by vigilant officers and trainees at the Kolomensk artillery school. True, they were deceived and told that the unit had been called to a parade.

[Sokolov] What do you think is the reason for these troop movements?

[Urazhtsev] This is not the first such incident. The same thing occurred in February of this year. I think this is related to fear on the part of the partocracy: Only negative information floats to the top, and the system is scaring itself. It seems to them that it is just about time to pay for 73 years of antipopular dictatorship and they are terrified by the specter of anticommunism... Yet the CPSU leadership, which still has jurisdiction over the KGB, the Army, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, cannot but know that the democrats are the main opponents of violence. They are accusing us saying that Shchit is all but creating a military detachment. What nonsense! The skeleton of Shchit is comprised of junior officers, company and battalion commanders, people who are close to the enlisted men, those who should NOT TAKE UP ARMS if they are given an order to attack the people, who should HOLD BACK the units at the time when destructive forces are trying to destabilize the situation.

[Sokolov] The Ministry of Defense asserts that it has no plans to introduce martial law in the country.

[Urazhtsev] As an officer who has worked in the Ministry of Defense for almost 10 years, I can state that they have always had these plans to be applied in the event that extraordinary circumstances arise. It is another matter that they had practically not developed it before. We now have a mass of reports from the districts and troops about training taking place there. In particular, they were conducted in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk in April, and then in the Far East Military District and in the Pacific Ocean Fleet. According to the plan, martial law is to be introduced gradually, beginning with the east through the various zones, and it should reach Moscow in eight hours. This is a convenient variant—it is always possible to follow the reaction of the people and, if necessary, turn back and say that what was going on in the east was training.

[Sokolov] Where do you get your information?

[Urazhtsev] There is not a single secret directive we do not know about. We have enough people sympathetic to democracy, including generals, both in the Main Political Administration and surrounding Yazov. Some day, as was the case with Kudinov, the country will learn their names.

[Sokolov] Tell me, did your union conduct investigations of military crimes in Afghanistan and Baku?

[Urazhtsev] Facts about illegal actions in Baku were turned over to the military prosecutor. We have information about Afghanistan as well. In particular, the Ministry of Defense has understated the number of deaths—they did not include, for example, those who died while being transported to the USSR. Incidentally, the publication of the lists was forbidden precisely because the parents did not find the names of their deceased offspring on them. A scandal broke out... The people are talking about terrible things: For example, a subdivision was sent on an operation on New Year's Day but the commanders got drunk and...forgot about it. Many soldiers froze to death in the mountains. All these cases are subject to investigation. We are far from having the whole truth about this criminal war.

[Sokolov] How do you assess the current situation in the Army?

[Urazhtsev] This is very difficult. The soldiers have to put up with "dedovshchina," lice, and slop for food. Each year an entire division of our men die—10,000-12,000 servicemen, an equal number end up in jail, and three times as many as that suffer from illness or injuries. It is impossible to drag the military reform out for decades, as Yazov suggests. We are faced with two dangers: spontaneous rebellion and a military coup.

It is no accident that on 24 September 43 Russian people's deputies called for the country's military servicemen to be vigilant in a situation where it is probable that attempts will be made to use the Army for political purposes, to exhibit restraint, courage, and patriotism, and not to allow the use of weapons against the people. I

think that if events develop according to today's scenario, Russia will have to think not only about creating its own ministry of defense—Shchit has suggested Tatyana Karyagina for the position of its leader—but also about its own national army, in order to provide for internal security, sovereignty, and the normal course of democratic reforms. Otherwise the Makashovs might get into office...

Solovyev Views Soviet Army Criticism

*LD0211142190 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] The situation within the Soviet Army and its role in society is of concern to military and civilians, young and old, prominent politicians, and ordinary people. Vyacheslav Solovyev believes this concern is reflected in the unprecedented wave of criticism of the national armed forces coming from newspapers and magazines, various parliaments in the country, and many public meetings.

Compared with the other national structures, the Army enjoys a greater degree of trust, but judging by the actions that the Army leaders have taken sometimes this trust is touch and go. Last September (?Army) units were secretly redeployed closer to Moscow when democratic groups were getting ready for a demonstration. The redeployment triggered an armed coup talk. The defense minister dismissed the talk.

Or take the latest nuclear explosion on the island of Novaya Zemlya. The local authorities had been told nothing about it and the public criticized the Defense Ministry for insincerity. Earlier, Defense Ministry generals refused to listen to the mothers of soldiers who died

in times of peace. The president of the country himself had heard the poor women pouring out their hearts. President Gorbachev told them that there can be no justifying losses of this kind by any laws of either humanity or the criminal code.

The mothers and the president agreed at their talk in the Kremlin that the national armed forces need a reform to improve discipline. And the president ordered to set up a commission to investigate the death of servicemen in peacetime.

Now will the Defense Ministry leaders meet the demands of its citizens? Will it be able to respond correctly to the criticism (?of) the Army? No, the Ministry is not yet ready for such a drastic turn judging by the hushed-up [as heard] development of the draft military reform, the efforts to discredit the authors of an alternative document, and the bitter attempts to uproot liberal thinking within the Army and reject proposals for ridding the armed forces of politics and affiliation with any political party.

But the medium and junior officers, let alone many conscripts, object to the conservative thinking of their generals. A recent report on the positions held by the military in the Russian Federation Parliament showed the higher rank of a man, the stronger is his desire to keep everything unchanged. That is why it would be wrong to describe the whole of the armed forces as stagnant. The public must help the progressive servicemen look for a way out of the impasse that the Army has found itself in.

This is true of a radical military reform in the first place and the reform could involve moves to make the armed forces professional and introduce an alternative armed service.

Baltic Republics

Prunskiene Discusses Problems Facing Lithuania

LD0511163790 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Interview with Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, by correspondent Roma Pakieniene; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Pakieniene] Madame prime minister, recently the Lithuanian government has been engaged and continues to be engaged in very extensive work, preparing its entire program and law package which will allow a basic restructuring of our economy. On the other hand your opponents, who criticize the government for its inactivity in the actual restructuring of our economy, have currently become very active. Within the legislature deputies who are economists criticize the draft program that you have prepared, and propose their own alternatives. It appears that these things may even result in delaying the approval of the government program, with the exception solely of the economic reform portion.

What is your view in these matters? Do these give you cause for concern and worry, or do you regard these on the contrary as totally normal?

[Prunskiene] First of all about the concerns, there are of course some concerns related not only to the program. Economic concerns are only half the problem—we are concerned with a multitude of other matters that are not connected either with laws or programs, that is the guarantees for the existence of a Lithuanian economy. The formation of such a guarantee is tied in with resource supply—from the Soviet Union republics while currently the central Soviet government wishes to retain a lot of competence. Thus in its members' view, and in the view of Russia for that matter, these questions are currently taking up a great deal of our time.

Well, as for the program not a single government is able to function normally without having prepared its own program in text or... or in some other fashion without planning its actions, without relating them with one another.

The government program was written not so much from the law—that is the government law—but from the obligations presented before the legislature through its annual deliberation of earlier documents. Those documents included the economic reform principles that had been discussed in July—and which were essentially approved—since the expressed remarks did not deny those assertions but only introduced one or another interpretation to [word indistinct] question or a desire to add to one point or another.

Our current program is, for the time being, wider than the economic reform. It consists of seven parts. [passage omitted]

Of course the central part is occupied by the economic and social reform program which the legislature had planned to give time to during the months of October and November. That is why it can probably be understandable that the disdain for deliberating the entire program may be excused only in the sense that [word indistinct] it is time to adopt, as soon as possible the most important reform documents. Certain features are set aside directly for the commissions, or else postponed for further perspective. This does not frighten us excessively because in truth there currently exists a desire to reach agreement with the legislature as soon as possible on the most important matters and to set practical actions on motion.

Naturally those who say the government is moving too slowly can say that it would have been better to start restoring independence at least 10 years earlier.

Everything passes through a certain logical sequence. We cannot thoroughly state T, without having said A, and all this is... namely following its turn. In the meanwhile, a whole series of documents and laws have already been presented before the Supreme Council and it is nearly falling behind in dealing and approving them, especially at times when it starts discussing somewhat too much an wastes time with trivial questions. [passage omitted]

Well of course various opinions abound concerning the program. By the way, we are aware of one thing currently, namely that those critical opinions concerning the government program are most often not tied in with proposals on what should be improved upon.

[Pakieniene] You are probably aware of the existence of an idea to establish a reform committee—a somewhat separate service that could be under [prie] the Supreme Council and the government and which could be accorded very extensive powers, and this service should be concerned with the very pressing economic reform matter, that is of the restructuring of our economy. This idea is supported by distinguished legislative economists, the majority of them are your opponents, what is your position on the establishment of such a committee?

[Prunskiene] Currently, I find it difficult to imagine that the Supreme Council, for example, could transfer a portion of its own competence to some committee that is not within its structure, especially if that were between the legislature and the government. I have in mind the issuance of laws and the confirmation of programs and concepts. As for the government, if here for the sake of economic reform one were to take it away from the government's activity, the question then would arise what will the Ministry of Economy do if it does not involve itself with reform? What will the Ministries of Social Security and Finance and all the existing ministry branches do if they are to function as if under a separate regime? Thus there will be a committee, outside the government jurisdiction, which will [word indistinct] reform while these ministries will deal with some type of routine and operational matters. This type of system

could hardly function. This is a common instance whereby, in order to solidify one's position, one searches for structures, the formation of which would place the government in another area.

If this government is incapable of carrying that out and if it is concluded that it cannot carry out reforms and at [words indistinct] to set in order Lithuania's affairs, in general the government should then be replaced instead of establishing satellites under the legislature, or between the legislature and the government, so as to have an increasing number of [word indistinct] that would explain relations among themselves. Moreover, that will not speed up matters.

We understand that very many difficulties exist here. [passage omitted]

[Pakieniene] You have stated so calmly: The government must be replaced. I would like to discuss just that with you since more vociferous and more open talk is heard in Lithuania, concerning the crisis in the government. Some assert that supposedly the present government will most probably have to resign, others think at least a partial renewal of the cabinet is necessary, and others speak out against changing the government, at least during the negotiation period. What are your views on this?

[Prunskiene] Well of course my opinion would probably be regarded as some type of tendentious view. However, during the formation of the government no type of game was embarked upon to select the less competent individuals first so that the stronger ones might be saved, while later on they might be invited. Well today it is very difficult in general to find, when we are discussing an assistant for privatization or leaders for a privatization service, the possibility to choose from several. We are lucky to find one or two. This [word indistinct] a great deal. It would be interesting to know what those individuals think who think that [word indistinct], as I am aware of, that those who propose to unseat the government are those who themselves aspire to become part of it since it is a question of how much motivation they have to prove to Lithuania, namely that they can solve these question better than [word indistinct] the present government.

As far as the existence of a government crisis is concerned, I personally cannot confirm that, for what is meant by a crisis? Most probably a crisis exists within relations with certain political forces, especially those found within the legislature itself. Moreover if currently one has to prove this there exists greater potential for crisis within the CP, or it is more evident there.

I think also that we may be able to search for other addressees. I would say the government is functioning normally. Difficulties do exist, but these are general difficulties involving Lithuania. It is difficult to find suitable cadres. Difficulties exist insofar as a whole group of individuals who had promised to come from abroad to fill at least consultative posts have halted their

decision temporarily, mainly because of the blockade, and later because of such talk having started about the government crisis and other matters, and of course these gaps are filled with great difficulty. However, I do not think any other government in Lithuania could resolve this question today in any other special way. [passage omitted]

Bickauskas Considers Negotiations 'Broken Off'

*LD0211215690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian
2020 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[INTERFAX report from Moscow]

[Text] The negotiations between Lithuania and Russia will not be simple and easy, stated the permanent representative of the Republic of Lithuania in Moscow, Egidijus Bickauskas.

Replying to questions by journalists whether negotiations on the recognition of Lithuania as an independent state have been completely broken off, he said he considers that this is so.

In the opinion of Egidijus Bickauskas, the chairman of the Russian legislature, Boris Yeltsin, even though favorably inclined towards Lithuania, is so far unable to recognize its independence because Russia is the USSR, and the USSR will hardly give up easily a part that belongs to it right now.

Vilnius Garrison Prepares for 7 Nov Parade

*LD0211153190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0100 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] The rattle of arms and marching of soldiers resounded around Vilnius' Gediminas Prospect last night. The Soviet Army's Vilnius garrison was practicing for a military parade which it plans to hold on 7 November in commemoration of the 73d anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Sometime earlier the republican legislature adopted a resolution noting that military parades can be held in Lithuania only with a Supreme Council Presidium permit. This type of permit has not been issued to date.

Meanwhile Vladislovas Svedas, a leader of one of the CPSU organizations in Lithuania and chairman of the Citizens' Committee of the Lithuanian Soviet Communist Party, has assured TASS News Agency that festivities to mark the October Revolution will take place even though this is contrary to the wishes of the Vilnius municipal authorities.

Meetings, demonstrations, and understandably a military parade are to be included in the program.

The organizers of these festivities are complying with the USSR president's decree.

As already known, 7 November is not on the list of holidays covered by the Lithuanian Republic law on holidays.

The Yedinstvo organization has a difference of opinion with the law and a majority of the country's citizen's. Its currently distributed proclamations contain exhortations not to report to work next Wednesday, 7 November. Especially [word indistinct] and insulting references are contained in the proclamations against some Lithuanian Legislative and Government leaders.

Gorbunovs Receives Invitation From Gorbachev

*LD0211190290 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
0530 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] A regular telegram addressed to Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR, not the Republic of Latvia, has arrived from the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, who invites him to take part today in the sitting of the Federation Council to discuss the Union Treaty. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet stood by its previous resolution, that the presence of the chairman of our republic's Supreme soviet in this sitting of the federation would not be useful.

A similar invitation has also been received by the Economic Commission of the Supreme Council. Ojars Kehris is invited to the sitting of the Federation Council to discuss economic problems. On this question, too, the Presidium stood by its previous resolution.

Attacks Against Latvian Servicemen Reported

*LD0311030790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2330 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] A quite alarming telegram has reached us from Latvia. According to figures published in the Latvian newspaper *UTRO JURMALA* [JURMALA MORNING] in October, the three Baltic republics saw 14 firearms attacks on posts, troop columns, and troop units. The upshot is that one serviceman was killed and six wounded. Two of the attackers were killed—one in Lithuania and one in Latvia—on the night of 2 to 3 October in the course of an attack on a sentry post in Daugavpils.

There have been cases of servicemen and members of their families being wounded and scarred. In Lithuania, on 27 June the eight-year-old daughter of a Soviet Army officer was pelted with stones by a gang of young people. The girl sustained serious head injuries.

The other main way of bringing pressure to bear on servicemen, reports the newspaper, is the so-called economic blockade of Army subdivisions. The air strip near Saldus, for example, is being subjected to this as is the helicopter regiment billeted near Jelgava. Military units have had their electricity and water cut off, while contracts to supply them with foodstuffs—including bread—to do their laundry, etc. have been broken.

Just recently, units billeted in Ogrskiy, Madonskiy, Liyepayskiy, and other rayons have received notification from the local authorities that as of 1 January 1991 the schooling of the children of the so-called occupationists will no longer be paid for. The servicemen will have to pay for the schooling of their children out of their own pockets. Thus, the unit billeted in the village of Liyelvarde in Ogrskiy rayon must, according to the bill presented, pay more than 160,000 rubles. In Madonskiy rayon the servicemen must pay 68,000 rubles.

We should note that there are no legal grounds in the form of relevant parliamentary or government decisions for these demands.

Training of Iraqi Technicians in Latvia Cut Short

*LD0311114190 Vilnius International Service
in English 2230 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] Iraqi Navy technicians being trained in a Soviet Navy training base near the Latvian capital Riga are due to leave Latvia by 15 November. Following a Latvian parliament decision [that] Iraqi military personnel should not be trained on Latvian territory, the administration of the Navy base has curtailed their training period, making it two months shorter.

Baltic Significance to Soviet Military Analyzed

*91UM0060A Riga BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA
in Russian 18 Sep 90 p 3*

[Article by Yu. Solntsev: "Is a Military Coup Possible in the USSR?"]

[Text] The question of the possibility of a military coup in the USSR is being discussed widely in the press of late. You can hear this thought very frequently in conversations with military personnel. Some of them believe that a military coup is the only way to preserve an empire that is collapsing before our eyes. How dangerous and real is such a threat? We will try to analyze it.

The worsening economic situation, uncertainty in what tomorrow will bring, and the weariness of the people from the disorder and confusion of the perestroika period are creating an objective basis for a military coup. It should also be added that the senior military leadership unquestionably would support such a measure.

But to execute a coup, in addition to the objective conditions, a subjective factor is also needed: i.e., there has to be a leader and organizer who has the capability to carry it out. It is this second factor that is absent. Stalin was the "great architect." In creating a totalitarian system of governing the state, he excluded the possibility of a military coup itself. While conducting a general militarization of society, he was concerned about the security of his own authority. The system he established also functions today without a hitch.

What did Stalin do? Everything is brilliantly simple: He dispersed the armed formations among various departments, put people in charge who were loyal to him, and established strict control over them by KGB organs.

Nothing has changed since Stalin's time. Today in our country there exist: the Army, the KGB and its troops, and also almost half a million troops of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. In the event that any one of these three forces got out of control, it was possible to count on the remaining two. The probability of a situation when all of the armed formations of the state became insubordinate is practically equal to zero. The probability of a secret conspiracy of all three leaders of these organizations is possible only theoretically.

As the most numerous force, the Soviet Army constitutes the greatest danger in the event of a coup. But here also, the same principle of splitting up exists. Along with ground troops and their commands, there are the airborne troops with their commander in chief who in equal measure are subordinate through the Ministry of Defense to the president. Besides them, there are several divisions of well-trained and armed marines in the Navy. All of them taken together are permeated by party structures and are controlled by KGB organs.

One can be absolutely confident that a classical coup in our country is completely out of the question. Only one person can conduct a coup in our state. He is called M.S. Gorbachev.

This assertion appears absurd only at first glance. The fact is that, while completely ruling out a classical military coup, we cannot rule out the use of the armed forces for the attainment of political objectives in the event that all of the other means do not give the desired result. It is not so important how it will be labeled—a coup or a strengthening of presidential authority, the prevention of interethnic clashes, defense of the integrity of the Union, or still something else.

The international weight of the Soviet Union and the prestige of its leaders and their influence on world politics have always been based exclusively on military power. By subordinating virtually the entire economy of the country to military needs and by robbing and ruining the people of the USSR, the ruling clique of the CPSU achieved military strategic parity in the 1970's with the richest countries of the world. A superpower that was impoverished but armed to the teeth brought fear to the countries of the West. They were forced not only to cope with the Soviet Union, but to curry favor with it.

If the "mailed fist" does not remain, then the Soviet Union loses its former influence in the world. Together with this, the influence, grandeur, and capabilities of the president of the USSR personally will fall. It is here that the interests of the military-industrial complex and M.S. Gorbachev coincide completely.

Therefore, the president of the USSR will agree to a recognition of the independence of the Baltic countries only in the most extreme case.

The loss of the Baltics will significantly weaken military power of the Soviet Union. With the acquisition of independence by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, troops will have to be withdrawn from the vitally important centers of Europe and the world's maritime communications routes, and the system of defense will have to be built on the territory of Belorussia and Russia. This will require a lot of time, enormous financial means, and material resources. Practically all of the garrisons now deployed on the territories of Latvia and Estonia will be redeployed to Pskov, Novgorod, and Leningrad Oblasts. Owing to a poorly developed network of roads and communications and the absence of an airfield and construction capabilities, the construction of new troop disposition locations will be very expensive. The Soviet Union does not have and it will not have the necessary resources for this in the near future. We are talking here about hundreds of millions of rubles.

The situation with Lithuania is particularly complicated. Its territory cuts the center off from Kaliningrad Oblast, on whose territory a major grouping of troops is concentrated, "hanging" over Germany. This "Soviet club" in the hands of M.S. Gorbachev today compels the Germans to treat him with special respect. Lithuania's acquisition of independence disrupts land routes and signals communications of this group of forces with the center and renders it dangerously vulnerable in a military sense, and it significantly reduces its danger for Europe.

M.S. Gorbachev cannot agree with this in any way. In one of his speeches with respect to events in Lithuania the president, departing from a prepared text, tossed out a phrase whose gist is that the Russians lost too much blood in the Baltics to give it away. True, he stopped short and did not say to whom it cannot be given back. Newspaper accounts did not carry this phrase, although, while not planned and not written beforehand, it was sincere.

Thus M.S. Gorbachev will never agree to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltics. There can be no doubt on this score. **This could occur only under another president or with the total breakdown of the USSR, which in essence means the same thing.**

Latvian People's Front Holds Party Congress

91UN0156A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 25 Oct 90 p 2

[Article by correspondent A. Timkov: "What Kinds of Promises? Notes on the Third Congress of the Latvian People's Front"]

[Text] The speech by Dainis Ivans, first deputy secretary of the Latvian Republic's Supreme Soviet, who is

already the former chairman of the NFL [Latvian People's Front] (because he decided to devote himself entirely to his work in the parliament) was characterized by a directive type of style and language. It was chock-full of words such as "crush," "destroy," "overcome," and "acknowledge." What must be crushed is the resistance of the conservative forces (read: "communists"), who are opposed to independence for this republic. What must be destroyed is the socialist system (the NFL faction in the parliament has already begun this process by eliminating 7 and 8 November from the list of holidays). What must be overcome is faith or belief in the communist ideals, which have brought nothing to the Latvian people but misfortunes, insults, and threats. And what this people must acknowledge is that the path to well-being and universal prosperity lies only through complete independence, privatization of property, private-enterprise type initiative, and industriousness.

As an absolutely necessary condition for the movement to restore state sovereignty, the program speech set forth the need to replace the present Supreme Soviet with a seym—the highest legislative organ of pre-war Latvia. By the way, the demand for a seym is not an original idea of D. Ivans; it has been recently stated to various audiences. But just what is it about the Supreme Soviet which is not to the liking of the NFL leaders? The main thing is, of course, the presence within the Supreme Soviet of the "Equal Rights" faction, which protects and defends the interests of this republic's Russian-speaking inhabitants. The seym must avert this "shortcoming" or "defect," for only citizens of the Latvian Republic would be able to elect or be elected to it. The concept of the citizenship law which was promulgated shortly before the Congress by a number of parties included within the NFL would deprive the right of citizenship to military service personnel, KGB staff members, and persons who moved to Latvia after 1940.

This dissatisfaction with the recently elected soviets at all levels, bodies in which the representatives of the NFL occupy a majority, is not, to my way of thinking, a random chance or accident. During the election campaign candidates to the office of deputy were not stingy in their bountiful promises. But having come to occupy the seats of power, they must demonstrate the capacity for coping with this power, to take at least the initial steps to prevent further decline in the people's standard of living, and to instill in them a confidence regarding a cloudless future. However, as noted by D. Ivans and Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Council of Ministers, the new administrative organs have become enmired in discussions; they take many decisions but do not concern themselves enough with practical matters, preferring to transmit them up to the higher-ranking organs. The thought was uttered that the NFL deputies have become dissolved in the depths of the previous apparatus and, therefore, it was said, could not sharply change the activity of that apparatus.

One cannot deny that the Congress participants attempted to propose genuine ways to extricate ourselves

from the crisis situation. In this, by the way, there is a difference between the present forum and the previous ones, where emotions predominated. However, the search for optimal solutions has been hampered by the lack of a national consensus. The discussions which flared up in the auditorium foundered on rocks like boats in shallow water. Under the conditions whereby the proportion of the indigenous population accounts for only 52 percent of the total, Latvians, just as was previously the case, are threatened with the fate of becoming a minority in their own, age-old land. The most radical-minded NFL members have proposed that a re-immigration be begun: with the aid of laws and practical circumstances, these members propose that Russian-speaking inhabitants be nudged or even compelled to move out of this republic. Certain persons have even taken pencil and paper and already calculated how many persons have to be "ushered out." But right-minded politicians see the absurdity of this proposal. Where would such refugees find shelter or places to stay, since the country, even without this, has hundreds of thousands of poor refugees? Therefore, they have proposed a zero-variant, under which all inhabitants having a permanent visa would become citizens of Latvia. There is also another point of view—to shift or postpone the solution of inter-ethnic problems to a later time period and during the present phase concern ourselves with economic matters, with the creation of normal living conditions. It is precisely this goal which has been proclaimed on many occasions by the People's Front. It is difficult nowadays to determine or predict how events will develop further. But one thing is obvious: within the society there is a feeling that people are fed up with the unplanned anarchic quality of political meetings, as well as with the euphoria regarding the independence that is being declared. There is already a newly appearing dissatisfaction with the new regime, which has completely inherited the vices of the old regime. It frequently distributes apartments and goods in acutely short supply to its own benefit and use; it "pads" staffs and adds bonus to wages. Due to these and other causes, the ranks of the People's Front have declined by almost 50,000 persons during this past year. There has been a marked decline in the number of persons supporting the People's Front among the non-indigenous population.

People have not accepted the idea of a return to private property, of privatization, as unanimously as has been assumed by the NFL leaders. Most peasants are against trading in land. The Congress participants arrived at quite a well-balanced evaluation or appraisal of the situation which has evolved; and they were unanimous in their opinion that the People's Front, having taken various political forces into itself, should remain consolidated and united. They have worked out a program and a charter, and they have renovated their leadership composition. It was specifically pointed out that they must intensify their demands on the leaders of the soviets; persons lacking the capacity for coping with matters or of developing self-government should be removed from this work. Whether the crisis phenomena

can be slowed down and overcome will depend upon whether the new leaders are able to achieve civic consent and to rally people in the name of upgrading the economy. It is precisely this which will reveal the maturity of the regime and the degree of the people's trust in it.

Pre-November 7 Rally Held in Estonia

LD0411093790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2046 GMT on 3 November carries a two-minute report on a demonstration in Keila, which is situated near Tallinn and at which a tank regiment is stationed.

The rally was held there because this is from where the Radio Station Nadezhda [Hope], the radio mouthpiece of the republic's International Movement of Working People of Estonia, Intermovement, is broadcast. The video shows speakers at the rally and a handmade poster: Hope is falsehood, slander, insult, provocation, a disgrace; it is the weapon of Red fascists against honest people! Another placard reads: Halt the abasement of the Army by dragging it into dirty political deals. A cardboard model of a tank bearing the legend "USSR" is doused in gasoline and set alight.

Today's newspapers carry a statement from the chief of the Tallinn garrison, Vice Admiral Yuriy Belov. It reads: "November 7 is our holiday, and we want to mark it as a holiday." "Nobody would argue with that, but for most of Estonia's inhabitants 7 November has essentially never been a holiday, particularly since this year it is not even going to be an official holiday for them. Is it really not possible to find a sensible compromise that will not breach the USSR president's decree or offend the sensibilities of the Estonian people? The Tallinn town soviet has suggested that the military could hold a parade at the memorial to the fighters for Soviet power in Estonia. There is plenty of space there, and public transport would not be disrupted." "Yet, this evening I witnessed a rehearsal for the military parade on Tallinn's Freedom Square."

Rally Turns Anti-Soviet

LD0511162790 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian
1800 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] I will begin with the protest rally held today near Keila Tank Regiment base. Over to Tiit Sinissaar.

[Sinissaar] The protest rally was organized by the citizens' committee of Keila parish, with (Virve Lepp) at its head, and was attended by about 200 people. About 20 people spoke, including numerous deputies of the Estonian Congress and also two Supreme Soviet deputies. The meeting, which was meant to be against the activity of the Nadezhda radio station, changed into an anti-occupation rally. One placard read: "Only a cowardly scoundrel can tell lies in a tank's shadow." A wooden model of a tank was burned at the rally, and the rally was

followed by a meeting with the leadership of Keila Tank Regiment. They claimed that they were obeying orders and said they had sent a letter in order to get rid of the radio station.

Rein Tamme, member of the Estonian Committee and chairman of the Supreme Soviet State Defense Commission, also spoke at the rally. He summed up the present situation and future tasks.

[Begin recording] Soviet imperialism and its local [words indistinct] have made a stake toward disintegrating our political system within the next few weeks. The planned fall of the government, and the Supreme Soviet becoming inoperable—because of the conflicts between Estonian political groups—are said to be the cause for a political vacuum which is to be filled by supporters of Intermovement. There is conviction in the accuracy of their calculations because the Estonian Committee has announced its political unity with Intermovement in the sense that the authority of the present transitional government is being denied. This was voiced at the [27 October] press conference held after the Estonian Congress. I believe that the opposite side will draw essential if untrue political conclusions from this. [passage omitted]

I voice a persistent and continuing disagreement against an armed political force staying on the territory of the Republic of Estonia. USSR armed forces are the armed forces of an alien state interfering in the internal affairs of the Republic of Estonia, and I demand that they leave the territory of the Republic of Estonia. Military systems of the USSR armed forces, together with their radio stations, must be dismantled. Installations at the disposal of the USSR armed forces must be returned to us—that is those which were snatched by them in 1940. Those which have meanwhile been constructed must be handed over to Estonian civil authorities and the military forces which are planned. The Republic of Estonia's army was fully taken over, and for 50 years our national gross product has been at the disposal of the USSR military-industrial complex.

The republic of Estonia will have to adopt its own defense law, create its own military structures, and stop relinquishing even volunteers to the USSR armed forces.

Those are my stances and I would like the people to support them. The near future will adopt this course. Thank you. [end recording]

Tallinn Garrison Chief Announces 7 Nov Parade

LD0211135490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1100 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Vice Admiral (Belov), chief of the Tallinn garrison, announced in the local press that a parade will take place in Tallinn on 7 November. Though the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium issued a statement on the impossibility of carrying out on its territory the USSR President's decree on military parades marking the 73d

anniversary of the October Revolution, the mayor of Tallinn proposed holding a rally and demonstration on 7 November not in the city center but in other areas on the grounds that, in accordance with the decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet, 7 November is not a public holiday and these activities would interfere with the normal movement of the city's traffic. A TASS correspondent finishes his report from Tallinn with the news that confrontation is becoming aggravated.

Estonian Party Protests Property Nationalization

PM0211151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Will the Case Go to Court?"]

[Text] Tallinn, 30 Oct.—The Estonian Communist Party is prepared to resort to judicial protection for its property rights. This was stated in the protest over the government decision to transfer to the republic's state offices the complex of buildings which previously housed the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Political Enlightenment Center. The protest has been submitted to the Estonian Supreme Soviet.

The government decision to nationalize the former Political Enlightenment Center and its plans to define the future ownership of the buildings and installations on the books of the CPSU and the Estonian Communist Party were based on the results of an investigation into the sources behind the financing of these buildings. It was established that during their construction extensive use was made of funds from the state budget, including the republic's foreign currency fund.

Protesting this infringement of party property, the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee has expressed readiness to use funds held by the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Administration of Affairs to make good the state budget funds used to build buildings and installations belonging to the party.

The Supreme Soviet's reaction to this protest is not yet known, nor is the fate of the draft resolution "On Defining the Legal Regime Governing CPSU and Estonian Communist Party Property on Estonian Territory."

RSFSR

Yeltsin 'Officially Reported' To Resume Work

LD0311190890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1810 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—It is officially reported here that Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, returned to Moscow today. In the evening he held a working meeting with Ruslan Khasbulatov, deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, and Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Republic's Council of Ministers.

Predicts USSR Resignation Demand

LD0511140290 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Natalia Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk November 5 TASS—"I came to you because you have had a misfortune," Russian Federal President Boris Yeltsin told the relatives of those who died on November 1 when a chemical factory workshop near the Ural city of Asbest exploded. Yeltsin arrived here by air early this morning and immediately headed for the scene of the tragedy.

The explosion of the accumulating tank, which contained a mining explosive produced in the workshop, claimed 15 lives.

When meeting members of the investigating commission, Yeltsin said that the commissioning of new facilities for the production of this explosive on Russia's territory would be postponed until all the causes of the explosion became known. Then the Russian president visited the bereaved families and gave them his condolences.

During a brief meeting with townsfolk, Yeltsin reaffirmed his earlier expressed opposition to the market plan submitted to the Soviet parliament by President Gorbachev and emphasized that the transition to a market would be the focus of attention at Russia's second congress of people's deputies, opening on November 27.

The congress, Yeltsin believes, will demand the resignation of the federal government.

Yeltsin leaves for Moscow by air tonight.

Khasbulatov Comments on Supreme Soviet Session

LD0211154390 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Report by TASS legislative correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—The main task of the first stage of the current session of the Russian Supreme Soviet was to "prepare a solid legal basis for the implementation of the economic reform", Russian Deputy President Ruslan Khasbulatov believes. Khasbulatov told TASS of the intermediary results of the session that began on September 3. The session is now adjourned until November 13.

During the past two months the session adopted 66 laws and resolutions, Khasbulatov said. Describing a package of economic laws, he stressed the need for "changing radically the economic system and the property relationship in the Russian Federation".

This is the reason underlying the adoption of a large package of laws and legal acts regulating property relations, which are aimed at creating an entirely new situation in the national economy. These include the law on the protection of the economic basis of Russia's sovereignty, which, according to Khasbulatov, is a step towards "the implementation of the declaration on the sovereignty of the Russian Federation".

According to Khasbulatov, interesting laws were adopted in the sphere of the development of political democracy, the protection of human rights and those of society. He pointed out that the Russian Parliament "advanced a great deal in protecting the rights of autonomous republics and other autonomous units".

At the same time, Khasbulatov pointed out that the republican leadership had failed so far to resolve problems dealing with the direct reorganisation of industry and agriculture in order to create organising and economic conditions for the transition to a market-oriented system. He stressed the need for a "dramatic reorganisation" of the system of management of the Soviet economy. He believes that it is necessary to "further expand the rights of union republics".

Silayev Interviewed on 500 Days Program Aspects

On Market Economy

LD0211181790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1730 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, by Aleksandr Belotserkovets; date and place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Belotserkovets] The critical state in which the country now finds itself must be overcome as quickly as possible and the guidelines for the stabilization of the national economy and the transition to a market economy, ratified recently by the country's Supreme Soviet, must grant the right to each Union republic to create and most importantly to implement its own program. Today is 1 November, the day that those of us in Russia have been awaiting with special attention and interest. That is because the 500 days program has started operating, has started working. What has now changed, Ivan Stepanovich? What is left? What is now the plan of practical action of the government of Russia?

[Silayev] Indeed, the program ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the Union is not a program but guidelines. This concept permits the republics to find their own solutions, but it does not mean that they are absolutely free in the choice of direction. Such questions as the system of our monetary circulation, credit, and finance, and a number of other questions must be united in any program envisaging the preservation of the Union. This is indeed envisaged also in the 500 days program. But I should say that there are also other limitations that do not really permit the republics to work with the great degree of

autonomy that is permissible with the maintenance of the Union. Nevertheless, there is a large degree of centralization and a number of other points, especially in the year 1991, and so naturally the question arises: What is being preserved in the 500 days program and what is being dismantled? Undoubtedly, that which is common to the very process of movement to the market is definitely being preserved. One can speak of whole sections, whole blocks, and also some parts of the relevant blocks of the 500 days program.

Concerning such a fundamental question as stabilization—the first 100 days—this work will not take place because inflationary processes are developing in such a way that it is becoming impossible to implement this first section.

Well, apart from that there remain some rather acutely disputed questions. These include the various positions on the private ownership of land. The position of the Russian Supreme Soviet and the Russian government have not changed. We consider it essential to introduce private ownership of land, with a certain regulating influence from the government and the Supreme Soviet aimed at preventing, in the first place, the selling of land into unqualified hands and at preventing profiteering or swindling. Land should work for its basic aim. To create, to produce agricultural produce; that is what it was created for by the Lord God, if you like. [laughs]

This is not a simple matter. The point is naturally that what are needed here are a number of legislative acts, legal acts. At the present time we are preparing a package of such bills. Not all and sundry can acquire land, primarily only those who can handle it in a qualified manner and work on it. Here too decisions will be made by local soviets on whether to give or not to give, to sell or not to sell this land to a particular applicant.

That is, on the one hand we consider it essential under market conditions to introduce private ownership of land without fail, and on the other hand we are taking steps to prevent abuse in dealing with land. This does not mean that we wish to destroy the collective system of land use. We are frequently accused of this and I categorically deny it. If the peasants wish to work in a collective farm, then good luck to them. But if a peasant wishes to leave the collective farm, he should have the appropriate juridical protection and leave with his appropriate share of the land and various fixed assets by mutual agreement with the management of the collective farm. This right should be protected by the law.

One could speak about a few other aspects. The main guidelines have dulled the principles of economic agreement between the republics. Our program contained a special section, Section No. 3. There is a particular reference to this here. Nonetheless, it is difficult to sense in these guidelines any clear trend toward a high degree of economic autonomy.

[Belotserkovets] Ivan Stepanovich, as we have touched upon life in the countryside and the land, I remember

that about three months ago I was with you in the villages of Staritskiy Rayon, Tver Oblast. What measures is the Russian government going to take?

[Silayev] We have a certain action program that will be announced at the end of November to the Congress of People's Deputies. In this action program, by way of preparations, we define the following principles. We should help the countryside in three areas. First, at state level we should help the countryside revive socially. We should take on the shoulders of the state the expenses connected with the construction of roads and the provision of gas mains and electricity. To a certain extent this includes the construction of hospitals and other social facilities. Second, we should interest any organizations working for the countryside—builders, machine builders, and any others in our national economy—in the advantages of working for the countryside, in making equipment, building housing, and other constructions. We should create incentives for this so that they are attracted to this work in the countryside.

[Belotserkovets] And make what is needed by the country dwellers and not what is needed by industry.

[Silayev] Absolutely. It should be profitable to work for the countryside for any participant in the process of working for the countryside.

Well, the third thing is to create economically advantageous conditions for the peasants to enable them to step up their output.

[Belotserkovets] You and I saw the start of the battle to save the harvest of potatoes, carrots, cabbages, and vegetables in the Moscow area. The very word battle arouses certain feelings. In your opinion, how much time will be needed for such battles to cease? Dutch farmers told us that when they have such terrible weather conditions, the army also comes in to help them. But this happens, they say, only once every 10 or 12 years. In our country, it happens every year.

[Silayev] Evidently it will take as long as our society needs to implement the basic principles of market relations. That is the first thing. Second, I would like to say that this battle cost our society colossal expenditures in personnel, material, and financial resources which were clearly out of proportion to the final result. As far as the Army is concerned, such terms are used as "The Army helped;" "The Army responded very well to the needs" as if this was a NATO army and not our own Army. The Army is a part of our organism, and nothing that takes place in our society can take place without the participation of the Army. This should be so, but not on principles by which it is necessary to telephone a hundred times and even to have direct instructions from the president for the Army to be brought in. The new economic relations that we call market relations should change the situation here and work in such a way that the Army should really perform labor functions.

But apart from that, here is something else that must of course be said. Holland and the other Western countries and the center and the northern zones of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] are not the same things. So it is necessary for science to do more work on this. We never have a year in which we do not slip into frosty weather and snowfalls. As a rule, a proportion of the harvest remains outside the framework of normal climatic conditions. Here is an example of this: If maize is moved northward, then there is a battle for every day for every hour that the ripening of maize can be reduced by. At one time it was 100 to 110 days. It has now been reduced to 76 days. By this means it can be persistently moved northward. As far as potatoes are concerned, unfortunately this has been forgotten about even though fast-ripening varieties did exist at one time and were studied.

Therefore what we need, apart from economic perestroika, are totally different approaches to economic management in the countryside, recognizing all forms of ownership including private ownership. It is necessary for science to study potatoes and improve varieties, particularly from the point of view of short ripening periods.

[Belotserkovets] Ivan Stepanovich, you are an aviation engineer. Precision is natural to you. One cannot manage in aviation without such precision. As chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, what is your opinion as to how long it will take to stabilize the market, to create on the consumer market even that level of goods which existed five years ago.

[Silayev] Here we must divide the task into two parts. The first part is to use any ways or means to slake the market's thirst, or if you like to give it artificial respiration—including the use of imports. The second part, the most considerable part, is to create the economic infrastructure which will actively promote the increase in the output of agricultural produce and consumer goods by the efforts of our enterprises, organizations, citizens, cooperatives, and so on.

Naturally the first surgical part cannot be maintained for long. Simply, there is not enough foreign currency. One can speak about a year or perhaps a little more. Subsequently what is needed is the active stepping up of the output of production by our economy. That in effect is the time which has been allocated to this. If in 1991 we have to use such extreme methods, then in 1992, somewhere about the middle of the year, our own economy should begin to liven up.

I am not going to start talking about the fact that we can do this considerably more quickly, two or three times more quickly, than the Ukraine; we have already spoken about this. So we in Russia can move ahead quickly. Perhaps we shall encounter some delays somewhere, but we would like to do this ahead of everyone else. We are tied by the common economy. We are tied by our

common Union market, the so-called economic space. Here there must be a very powerful synchronization of actions.

It is another matter that we are able to move forward in a more organized and considered manner and, taking account of the specific conditions of the 500 days program, with a certain acceleration—we intend to act in this way. But a number of such fundamental problems will synchronize the work of all the republics.

[Belotserkovets] There are two to two and a half million people unemployed in the country today. With the transition to a market system, the question of unemployment now frightens lots of people. How will social protection be ensured on the labor market, according to the Russian program?

[Silayev] This is a serious and complicated question. It is something quite new, just like other questions. Therefore, we are preparing for this in our corresponding committees and organizations. We have it in mind to provide considerable support, first of all for those comrades who lose their job, taking account of a certain minimum living wage for a certain period while he seeks work but we also have in mind to help them to undergo some sort of retraining, to obtain different qualifications.

As a separate matter it is necessary, and we are now studying this, to provide good protection for young people who naturally may not yet have high qualifications, and who might feel the brunt of the market economy in the first instance. We are giving thought to this and we are already working on how to do this.

But it must be said here that physically healthy, normal people should not be frightened of the market economy as it will enable them to display their potential, enterprise, work capacity, and qualifications. The market holds no fears for them. It can hold fears for people who have got accustomed, at the expense of the common collective labor, to finding as comfortable a position as possible, accustomed to working as little as possible and taking as much as possible, and they are the first to shout about some sort of social injustice and so on. Well, this stratum—I hope that there are not such a lot of them even though they do exist—they should really be afraid of this and give serious thought to this if they are capable of working. These are harsh conditions which require that everyone should work who is capable of doing so.

[Belotserkovets] It is well known that 46,000 enterprises—works and factories—throughout the country could be privatized. It is also known that 760,000 trade and public catering enterprises could be privatized. What is the position with regard to privatization in Russia, and how will this proceed?

[Silayev] Right now a list is being prepared of enterprises, organizations, and uncompleted projects—this is also very important. In the first instance these are small enterprises, particularly in the services sphere, in the

trade sphere, in the small business sphere—if one can express it in that way—aimed at the social sphere. It seems to us that this where it can be most rapidly implemented with regard to both cost and return.

Of course, it is more complicated and it is necessary to examine in great detail the privatization of today's major enterprises such as Zil and KamAZ. Here there is another idea—joint stock societies, the creation of conditions in which each worker will know that a small part of everything that exists at the works belongs to him and he has an interest in ensuring that this should grow larger and he will receive the direct result of this work.

Therefore we do not expect, especially with regard to major enterprises, that citizens will be queuing up to ask to buy them as quickly as possible. But as far as small enterprises are concerned, we shall be encouraging this actively and creating the corresponding conditions. Such work is now under way, and it is being determined which enterprises these are and in what area, the residue value and conditions. Preparatory work must be carried out on all this in the remaining months of this year.

Here is what I would also like to say to you, dear comrade listeners. We intend firmly to follow the mapped out course guided by the main provisions of the program adopted by the Supreme Soviet, naturally with amendments connected with the adoption of the basic guidelines.

This program can be implemented only by the joint efforts of the Supreme Soviet, the government and the people of Russia. We believe that we shall fulfill our tasks precisely on these principles if we maintain in constant communication with the people and if we work in the interests of our people. Correspondingly we need major support from them, of course. Only in this case—when we have mutual understanding and the consolidation of all ethnic groups as a united whole—will the success of the 500 days program be ensured. We are counting on this way in a big way.

On Economic Reform

LD0211180990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1915 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, prime minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, by reporter I. Minayev, in the television studio; date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Minayev] Ivan Stepanovich, I think that our television viewers are primarily interested in what program the government is beginning to work by because the 500 days program, about which so much was talked, no longer exists. It has become outmoded. I mean more the first part of this document which proposes the stabilization of the economy. Is this so or not?

[Silayev] Unfortunately this program is not completely the right one. I will not talk about the circumstances of why it is not the right one. On one hand it is not the right

program in its first part which envisioned the first 100 days, when basically measures were to be adopted which would have led to the stabilization of the ruble and to the stability of its exchange rate. They are indeed measures to rapidly stabilize negative processes such as the growth of inflation and other processes.

On the other hand, the basic reforms in the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program will be implemented if, naturally, we fulfill all those intentions which seem necessary to us today. Therefore, from the point of view of reformation, from the point of view of resolving the basic problems concerning the movement and functioning of market relations under market economy conditions, it is for all that the right program.

[Minayev] Excuse me, but the name of Yavlinskiy has already been mentioned several times. He resigned, but the viewers do not know what the future holds for the originator of the 500 day program.

[Silayev] Today, while continuing to remain the deputy chairman on reform with his group, he....

[Minayev, interrupts] That is, you....

[Silayev, interrupts] No. We have agreed that they will now transfer to a specific action plan for each of our ministries, for each of our committees. The action plan will be introduced within days, not hours. They are concluding this work now, and it will form the basis of the government report at the extraordinary congress of Russian deputies.

[Minayev] Incidentally, in the forthcoming work, more precisely on tactics and strategy, I will refer to your speech yesterday in the legislature where you said—referring once again to the speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in the middle of October in the Supreme Soviet, where he said that three options are possible—three behavioral options for the leaders of the Russian Federation in the event the center does not propose a program but the basic guidelines, which has indeed happened.

You chose—I do not know whether you were speaking for yourself or for the government in this case, or more broadly—you chose the second option, the option which I would call the coalition option.

[Silayev] I can say that this is the position of our government. It takes as its starting-point the real-life situation that has developed. On the one hand, there is the Russian Congress declaration to the effect that the Russian Federation will remain, and does remain within the composition of the Union, within the composition of the USSR—of course in accordance with new principles taking account of respect for the sovereignty of all republics, including Russia too.

[Minayev] Does that mean that, let us say from today, you are heading toward the creation of a new coalition government in which different tendencies and different views will be represented?

[Silayev] Well, actually we are not saying that from 1 November we are adopting that course. We simply regard it as essential in the situation that has developed in which all Union republics have adopted their declarations of independence and sovereignty—that is the first point—in which the principles have also been formulated by the USSR Supreme Soviet to the effect that there must be voluntary delegation of functions to the center, the Union body, and there must be not only proper representation but also the active participation, with the casting vote, of republics in Union bodies. Consequently, it is a coalition. If that is the case, then there must be a reformulation of the principles for the creation, inter alia of a Union government on a coalition basis.

[Minayev] It seems that the main condition for implementation of the program is, of course, the attainment of full and genuine as it were, economic sovereignty in the first instance, if I can put it that way—not to mention political sovereignty. What is the situation as of today? Can you say that we are at least 10 percent or 20 percent free to decide for ourselves?

[Silayev] Of course it is hard to define the degree of freedom by percentages. But unfortunately the formulation of proposals on a number of vital economic principles such as the financial plan, the material plan, and the centralization of resources for 1991 deprives us of any acceptable degree of economic independence. That does not, of course, facilitate active entry into the market and into market relations. When 90-95 percent of the resources produced on Russian territory are centralized by central bodies, and specifically by Gosstab [USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], it is impossible to talk either of economic independence or of minimum conditions for market relations. That is why the Russian Supreme Soviet has recently adopted several draft laws that do nevertheless protest and defend the right of the republic, all of its bodies, and the whole of its national economic mechanism to economic independence and sovereignty.

[Minayev] Here is a debatable point. After the Russian legislature has adopted any decision—well, let us say if we take just the recent case when the decision on the impermissibility of combining official functions was adopted—the Union appeals committee annuls that decision. This would be a contradiction which could not be sidestepped. To what extent are these decisions valid? To what extent should we, to put it bluntly the Russian electorate, have faith in them?

[Silayev] The calls for coalition, amalgamation, and consolidation must be bilateral. We are also prepared to find solutions but we expect and insist that we are not ignored and that our sovereignty is respected, bearing in mind that we are not contemplating secession. We are for the Union. We are for an economic Union.

[Minayev] In mutual relations with the republics, the conclusion of direct treaties with the republics—only

economic ones so far—is under way. What is the state of affairs today, and what primarily is slowing down that work?

[Silayev] Today there are only three or four republics to speak of with whom we have not signed treaties on economic cooperation for 1991. But there are no major problems here. A minimum amount of time is simply needed here in order to complete all of this. And we have no doubt that this process will be finished by 15-20 November.

[Minayev] You will find a common language?

[Silayev] Yes, we will find a common language, and we will in this way put into practice the economic assistance and the economic cooperation which strengthen our Union. This is a most important and fundamental aspect of the matter. To the present day, literally during the last ten days, we have signed three agreements with Belorussia, with the Ukraine, and with Kazakhstan. These are very important partners of ours. Well, we dealt with one another directly.

[Minayev] But does this mean that in doing this you are cutting the ground from under the feet of the Union ministries from which and through which all links between the republics previously ran?

[Silayev] Well you see, we are simply making natural what was not natural. The success of the reform does not consist of taking things away from one another and declaring this the property of, let us say, Russia. The main thing all the same is to create the economic conditions, the prerequisites for enterprises—this is the basic link—to achieve success in the economy, to be economically free, and even, if you wish, for them to be economically independent.

[Minayev] Yesterday you spoke about the fact that a federal committee would be set up. In doing this, will the work of the Russian government be noticeably reorganized? Briefly, what is the principle behind the reorganization?

[Silayev] We feel, we have felt a certain distance between our actions and the actions of the regions, in the absence of interaction and even of mutual understanding. For this reason, I think, a very interesting conversation took place with all of our (?74) organizations today—territorial-republican, territorial-autonomous—and we reached an agreement that constant contact is essential to us and only a representation of some kind, let us say by territory... but active membership in state bodies by our main autonomous regions, republics and territories [as heard].

This is how the idea arose that we set up such a committee. It is not a public committee, and it is not a council attached to something else. It is a permanently acting body with permanently acting participants who will, in accordance with certain principles, rotate from time to time so that people will not be isolated from real

life. Therefore it is a most important task to form such a committee within a short period of time. We are counting on this to a great extent. Consequently, the structure of the government as a whole should be organized accordingly and optimized.

[Minayev] Well, Ivan Stepanovich, let us hope that when the chief of staff regroups its forces, matters will progress more quickly over the whole huge territory of our Russian Federation. I wish you success.

[Silayev] Thank you.

RSFSR 9-Month Economic Performance Analyzed
PM0511110490 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Russia: Figures for the First Nine Months"]

[Text] Statistics for the first nine months of the year testify to the intensification of many unfavorable tendencies in the Russian national economy, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Statistics report entitled "The Socioeconomic Situation in the RSFSR (First Nine Months of 1990)" says. The output of consumer goods in industry (group "B") increased 5.8 percent compared with the first nine months of 1989. At the same time the population's money income increased 14 percent. Unsatisfied demand exceeded 110 billion rubles [R]. Everywhere there were shortages of consumer goods and paid services. These shortages emerged most severely in supplies of food, industrial production of which increased by only 2.2 percent in comparison with the corresponding period last year. The quota-based release of goods for retail is becoming increasingly widespread, and ration cards are being introduced. The real prices of purchases are growing at an appreciable rate.

The increasing disarray of the consumer market is conducive to destabilization of the entire economy and retards the national economy's progress toward the market. Production of means of production in industry (group "A") over the nine-month period was 2.5 percent down on the same period last year.

There was a decrease in the amount of national income produced. Whereas in the first six months of the year it was 1.3 percent down on the corresponding period last year, in the period January through September it was 3.5 percent down.

The RSFSR's exports over the nine-month period totaled R28 billion, 7 percent down on the corresponding period last year. Imports were up by 3 percent at R34 billion. A negative foreign trade balance (minus R6 billion) thus resulted. Deliveries of output by way of trade exchange by enterprises with direct links with foreign partners grew by 8.3 percent.

As of 4 September 1990 1,345 joint ventures involving firms and organizations from foreign countries had been registered on RSFSR territory.

The number of births in January-September was 125,000 down on the corresponding period of 1989, and the number of deaths was up by 75,000. It is expected that by the end of the year the republic's natural population growth will amount to about 320,000 people—this is almost half the figure for 1989.

A total of 74.4 million people were employed in all spheres of activity in the January-September period, including 67.3 million workers and employees, 3.9 million kolkhoz [collective farm] members, 2.1 million cooperative workers (excluding people with more than one job), and 1.1 million people engaged in individual labor activity and in private subsidiary agriculture.

Some 1,400 industrial enterprises, 8,800 stores and public catering enterprises, 104 everyday service enterprises and service centers, and 237 public motor transport enterprises were operating on the lease system. The internal farm lease contract system is developing in agriculture, and the number of peasant (individual) farms is increasing.

Losses of worktime in industry and construction due to absenteeism, idle time, absences with the permission of the administration and mass nonattendance grew by 30 percent. As a result of the strikes staged at 247 enterprises in the January-September period, output to the tune of R12 million was not produced.

The profits obtained by enterprises and organizations in the republic in the nine-month period were 6 percent down on the corresponding period last year at R90 billion. The sum of R56.5 billion was paid from profits into the state budget on RSFSR territory, which is R1.8 billion less than in January-September last year. Turnover tax brought in R54.3 billion, which is R4.6 billion more.

The population's money income in the nine-month period amounted to R271 billion, an increase of 14 percent as against a planned estimate for the whole year of 4.8 percent. The population received payments and benefits of R90.7 billion from social consumption funds—R6.8 billion more than in the first nine months of last year. The population's money expenditure came to R258 billion.

The growth in prices of goods and services continued and the consolidated index in the January-September period reached 103.7 percent, a figure which includes 104 percent for goods. Prices of nonfood products were five percent up on the same period last year; virtually all types of these products were up. The growth in food prices was 3 percent. Prices in kolkhoz markets were 29 percent up on the January-September period last year.

Production of consumer goods, including alcoholic drinks, amounted to R184 billion (in retail prices), which

is R12.8 billion more than in the corresponding period last year. Given the increase in money income, this growth was not noticed on the consumer market and did not decrease customer demand.

Meat production decreased in comparison with the corresponding period of last year in 60 of the 73 autonomous republics, krais, and oblasts; production of animal oils decreased in 60; and production of whole milk products decreased in 20.

Production of nonfood goods (excluding light industry goods) amounted to R66.3 billion, 16 percent up on January-September last year. In part this increase was due to conversion processes at defense complex enterprises.

Revenue from trading in consumer goods produced within the republic grew by 11 percent, and revenue from trading in imported consumer goods grew by 20 percent. Retail commodity turnover was R24 billion (14.7 percent in real prices) up on January-September 1989; 70 percent of the increase was due to increased sales of goods, and 30 percent was due to the growth in average purchase prices.

In the RSFSR 1.3 million crimes have been recorded since the beginning of the year, 12 percent more than in the corresponding period last year.

The total volume of industrial production decreased by R1.9 billion (0.5 percent) over the nine-month period in comparison with January-September last year. Labor productivity in industry increased by 1.6 percent. The number of working people decreased by 2.5 percent. The prime cost of industrial output increased. The volume of output not delivered to consumers was R6 billion—R1.5 billion more than in January-September last year. Contractual commitments for deliveries of output were 98.3 percent fulfilled; 25.2 percent of enterprises did not manage to fulfill them.

In the agro-industrial complex food products to the tune of R56.2 billion (at retail prices) were produced at food industry enterprises in the first nine months of the current year. The growth in the production of these products was only R1.2 billion in comparison with the same period last year (as against planned estimates for the year of R6 billion).

On the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhoses [state farms] more than 120 million tonnes of grain had been threshed as of 22 October, and 33 million tonnes had been sold to the state. The state order was 69 percent fulfilled.

As of 22 October winter grain crops had been sown over an area of 16.5 million hectares, 2.6 million hectares less than by the same time last year; fall plowing had been carried out on 44.0 million hectares compared with 60.8 million hectares last year.

Purchases of livestock products in January-September amounted to 8.2 million tonnes of livestock and poultry (live weight), 33.5 million tonnes of milk, and 25.66

billion eggs. Forward contracts for purchases of livestock and poultry in 1990 were 74 percent fulfilled in the nine-month period, those for milk were 84 percent fulfilled, and those for eggs were 77 percent fulfilled.

In January through September R25.6 billion in capital investments from all sources of finance were used to develop the agro-industrial complex, including sectors providing agriculture with the means of production. The volume of investments grew by two percent.

In capital construction the commissioning of the projects stipulated in the state order for the nine-month period was not ensured.

A total of 538,000 apartments with a total area of 32.8 million square meters (43 percent of the projected annual volume) were commissioned from all sources of finance. In comparison with January-September last year the commissioning of housing was 12 percent down, the commissioning of schools was 29 percent down, the commissioning of hospitals was 28 percent down, the commissioning of preschool establishments was 18 percent down, and the commissioning of clubs and houses of culture was 14 percent down. Commissioning of polyclinics and outpatient establishments was 32 percent up.

Fixed capital with a value of R56 billion—six percent less than in the corresponding period last year—was commissioned from all sources of finance.

Silayev Holds 'Consultations' With Army Officers

LD0211234190 Moscow World Service in English
2110 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] An estimated 600 army officers, sitting on all levels of councils from district to republic, have had a meeting in Moscow on Friday with the prime minister of the Russian Federation, Mr. Silayev, and Mr. Yeltsin's representative, Mr. (Burbulev). More on this:

In Mr. Silayev's words, the meeting was prompted by the need for consultations rather than extraordinary circumstances. Mr. Silayev said the Army must be involved in the republic's decision-making as servicemen were fullfledged members of the society. For its party the Russian government, he said, is prepared to consider all the social and economic difficulties facing officers and their dependants. Mr. Yeltsin's representative, speaking later, spelt out support for an end to the confrontational attitudes in the country and the republic. He called for unity of all forces as the only way towards progress. He said that lying behind the confrontation between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Yeltsin was the battle of two notions as to where the country should move.

Mr. (Burbulev) pointed out that further progress was largely dependent on the Army's position and that all talk about a possible coup is evidence of how important the current situation is and a warning that the Army may have its own views on the political situation. A fierce

debate followed with some of the officers trying to accuse the organizers of the gathering of attempting to drag the army into the political fray. At one point the officers refused even to discuss the draft military reform drawn up by Russia's Public Security Committee. However, discussions were soon back to normal and the speakers focussed mostly on the need for resolving the difficulties facing servicemen and their dependents.

The Russian prime minister, Mr. Silayev, speaking afterwards said the aid of the meeting had been achieved. The prime minister's impression was that similar processes were under way within the army and the country. He said despite the upsurge of emotions the atmosphere of well-wishing prevailed. Mr. Silayev arrived at the conclusion that most of the Army deputies had shown understanding of the Russian government's problems, which he said was very important.

RSFSR Signs Trade Agreement With Malta

LD0411191790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1505 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Dmitriy Fedotov]

[Text] Valletta, 4 Nov (TASS)—Last Friday V.N. Yaroshenko, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] minister of foreign economic relations, signed the first direct trade agreement here between the Russian federation and a foreign state—Malta. The very next day the first contract was concluded for the supply to this Mediterranean country of 60,000 tonnes of Kemerovo coal in exchange for consumer goods which will replenish empty shelves of shops in the oblast.

The agreement is for five years after which it will be automatically prolonged if neither of the sides expresses the desire to review its terms, Yaroshenko said in an interview for a TASS correspondent. Like any intergovernmental agreement it creates the legal basis for subsequent activity and actually establishes a kind of most favored status in trade between Russia and Malta. As regards the contract for supplying Malta with 60,000 tonnes of above-plan from Kemerovo, the minister continued, it is very important that such rich Russian regions should be able, within the framework of the foreign economic activity of the RSFSR, to satisfy their own needs, particularly in conditions of the acute shortage of consumer goods.

One of the most important points of the agreement, Yaroshenko noted, is the clause on the continuity of contractual obligations which seeks to stabilize our foreign economic relations. The Russian government will bear responsibility for all contracts, including long-term ones, which were previously concluded by the Union government if the resources, goods, or services agreed in them are found on RSFSR territory. This is a very important aspect when one takes into account the fact

that we regard some of the accords that are in effect as disadvantageous, but that we are nevertheless undertaking to observe them.

It would be logical, the RSFSR minister of foreign economic relations feels, if in those countries where Russia accounts for more than 50 percent of trade turnover with the USSR—and in most cases this is even 70-80 percent—the Russian government were to propose candidates for trade representatives, their deputies or commercial advisers—depending on the specific features of the state concerned. It goes without saying that no one is proposing to recall trade representatives, but when vacancies arise we shall propose our candidates. The central government may not agree with this, but I think that some kind of compromise will be found, Yaroshenko said.

The signing of the agreement with Malta is the first step on the path to concluding trade agreements between Russia and foreign partners. Which is next? The minister did not name a specific country, but did not rule out that it would be one of the states of East Europe.

Gidaspov Cited on Leningrad 7 Nov Parade

*LD0211215390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Report by correspondent S. Dukhavin in Leningrad; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] How will the coming holiday be marked in the city on the Neva? Look at this report from our Leningrad correspondent:

[Dukhavin] After lengthy and fairly heated debate this question has at last been decided. The Leningrad city soviet executive committee has approved the decision of the session on the holding of demonstrations.

A news conference heard about one of the demonstrations whose initiators are the oblast committees of the party and the Komsomol, the oblast trades union committee, and the committee of war and labor veterans. As yet there is no information about another demonstration which will be held at the suggestion of the coordinating council of the northwestern branch of the Democratic Union Party.

Answering a question about yesterday's decision by the country's Supreme Soviet Presidium on the inexpediency of holding parallel or alternative demonstrations and rallies in Moscow on 7 November Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the oblast party committee, said in particular:

[Gidaspov] This measure applies only to Moscow. We would be against such a decision in respect of Leningrad. We think that if the CPSU, the trade unions, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and veterans are granted the right to hold their festive procession and moreover to hold a rally, then why should other organizations be deprived of this right? It

would be unfair. It is another matter regarding the direction that the rally will take. From my viewpoint it would be very good for this rally not to be an alternative one and for this rally also to include calls for civic harmony, peace, and everything of which there is such a shortage in our tense society.

Leningraders Polled on Parade

*LD0211220390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1900 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] How will Leningrad celebrate 7 November holiday? Our correspondent Matvey Frolov reports:

[Frolov] This year's celebrations will be in sharp contrast to previous years. There will no grandiose and mostly formalistic decorations around the city. The numerous red banners will be missing this year. After all, morale is markedly worse. There will be a naval parade on the Neva on 7 November. The people of Leningrad are very fond of the sailors. They always give them a hospitable reception. The warships took up station in the Neva roadsteads today.

There will be a military parade on Palace Square. Five thousand troops representing all branches of the armed forces, motorized infantry, paratroopers, artillerymen, missile troops, and border guards will take part in it. The cadets of the Nakhimov and Suvorov Academies, who always delight the spectators, will also be in the parade. The festivities will continue with civilians filing past the Winter Palace. This procession will consist of two parts, as it were. First of all, there will be a demonstration and meeting organized by the oblast committee, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], the trade unions, and the committee of war and labor veterans. The participants in the meeting, who will be representing local workers, will head for the Marsovoye Pole where they will lay flowers at the Grave of Heroes of the Revolution and the Civil war.

But on Palace Square there will also be a demonstration and meeting organized by the coordinating council of the northwestern branch of the Democratic Alliance. In accordance with tradition an artillery salute will be fired in the city. The beacons on the Rostral Columns will be lit.

The organizers of the first procession held a press conference today. Gidaspov, first secretary of the CPSU oblast committee; Vorobyev, secretary of the Oblast Trade Union Council; Tammi, a veteran of the revolutionary movement; and Vorchakov, first secretary of the Komsomol oblast committee, spoke about preparations for the festivities. The participants in the press conference disclosed the results of an opinion poll in which the views of 600 citizens of Leningrad were sampled two days ago. Some 56 percent supported the idea of holding a demonstration. Another 14 percent were categorically opposed to it. The interviewees were asked how they would have voted had they been members of the Leningrad soviet. Some 61 percent said they would have voted

to allow the demonstration to go ahead. Another 18 percent favored banning it. Another 19 percent would have abstained.

The poll revealed one other thing. Some 38 percent said they supported the first demonstration. Another 25 percent supported the second one. So as you see, views are polarized. This makes it even more essential to achieve civic accord now.

RENMIN RIBAO Delegation Visits Leningrad

*PM0211152790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent N. Volynskiy under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Leningrad, 30 Oct—The visit to our country by journalists from the Chinese Communists' fraternal newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, headed by its chief editor—Comrade Shao Huaze—is continuing.

At the Smolnyy the Chinese journalists talked with B. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee. In a warm and friendly atmosphere there was a discussion and assessment of various aspects of the Chinese and Soviet versions of perestroika and the renewal of socialism. During the discussion Comrade Shao Huaze voiced the idea of opening a RENMIN RIBAO correspondents' center in Leningrad. This idea was supported by B. Gidaspov.

The guests visited the cruiser "Aurora," the V.I. Lenin Museum in the Smolnyy, museums, and theaters.

Western Republics

Crisis Situation in Gagauz Republic Continues

Gorbachev Interviewed on Situation

*LD0211195490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by correspondent Minayev; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Gorbachev] (?Yesterday) I received people by decision of a plenum of the Communist Party of Moldova [Moldavia] Central Committee. A whole delegation was sent here to talk and meet with me. Tomorrow I will be meeting with the President of Moldova and other comrades from the republic.

Indeed, the situation in the Moldovan republic worries us very much. There is a great threat to peace and normal life in that very wonderful republic of ours, where people were renowned for being able to live in unison and work well and have achieved very much on their soil. Now events have developed in this way. I will not now go

deep, so to speak, into the roots of this, but it is a worrying situation. The integrity of the republic is threatened.

We had this subject come up, too, at the Council of the Federation, and the general view of all members of the Federation Council and the representatives of the republics was a wish that everything be done to halt this process. As yet it has not, say, assumed such an irreversible character. Lively contacts and cooperation between people have not been disrupted, but signs have already appeared that this crisis could become very exacerbated. Then there could be a calamity. There could be a calamity.

Let me say bluntly that everything now needs to be done by everyone, both the center and the republic's leadership, to halt these processes and to turn everything toward normality. There is but one principle: the integrity of the republic and actions to respect the system and comply with the constitution of the republic and the Union Constitution. It is necessary to tackle more resolutely all those people who are acting as instigators or attempting to act as instigators and take advantage of what has arisen.

You know, we have to tackle the separatists resolutely here—separatists of any hue. For this reason we must now come to the aid of the republic and return it to its normal course. For this reason, I am decisively in favor—and I hope that this will be communicated—of them hearing the opinion of the center and mine as president. We will not leave the republic in trouble, and we must restore normal life, the functioning of all institutions, and the operation of the laws and the operation of the Constitution.

[Minayev] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what in your view are the immediate measures that need to be taken by the center to stabilize the situation in this republic?

[Gorbachev] I think that now—and this was talked about today among us, and we will meet tomorrow—the most important thing is to halt things because it is now coming to the point of direct clashes there. From this point of view we are acting with everybody, with representatives, foremost with the president, and we support him in halting the situation now. Tomorrow we will talk about what needs to be done to clear up some issues that have mounted. But for us one thing is clear—the inviolability and integrity of Moldavia, the harmonious living together of all peoples. I think, you know, there will be no peace if these Moldovans feel uncomfortable on their own land. Moldovans will also not feel happy if somewhere something remains unjust in regard to others.

This all needs to be examined. Those are the wrong issues—it all can be, and needs to be solved, to sit down and solve everything. Tomorrow we will agree how to act.

[Minayev] There is no need here, of course, to be overhasty.

[Gorbachev] But the most important thing now is to stop all these events and critical processes. The Constitution and the law must operate. I think that people will support us.

State of Emergency Declared

LD0211160790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1525 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Fedor Angeli and Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 2 Nov (TASS)—A state of emergency has just been declared in the Moldovan [Moldavian] towns of Dubossary, Tiraspol, and Bendery situated on the banks of the Dnestr. This decision, as reported to TASS correspondents on the telephone by Aleksandr Parazhan, deputy chairman of the Dubossary town soviet, was taken after signals started coming in that armed detachments were moving toward those towns from the Kishinev side.

Moreover, the deputy mayor did not specify what kind of formations they were. A Russian-speaking population, which earlier declared the creation of a Pridnestrovskiy Republic within the composition of the USSR, predominates in that region in the east of the republic.

All the inhabitants of Dubossary, in the words of Aleksandr Parazhan, "are getting ready to defend the town; are closing off the bridges across the Dnestr". He said: "We demand the introduction of troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and not the Kishinev militia and formations of volunteers."

At the same time the situation is gradually becoming normal in regions densely-populated by the Gagauz (Turks-Christians), where a state of emergency was declared earlier on. All industrial enterprises, establishments, and organizations are working. Children are going to school. The roads are open. Soviet and foreign correspondents have been allowed to visit Gagauz villages.

'Alarming' Reports from Moldavia

LD0211175590 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev November 2 TASS—Alarming reports began arriving today from the city of Dubossary in Eastern Moldavia during a session of the republican parliament.

Moldavian Prime Minister Mircha Druk told deputies that late on Thursday a unit of volunteers from Rybnitsa, returning from Moldavia's southern regions, populated by the Gagauz, surrounded the prosecutor's office, city court, and regional executive committee, driving all the officials out.

A rally was held in Dubossary this morning and the bridge across the Dniester River was blocked.

According to Mircha Druk, he ordered the police to clear the bridge, the roads and offices in the city.

The arrival of Moldavian volunteers on the right bank of the Dnester and police actions prompted a sharp negative reaction of residents—who began throwing stones. A police officer was wounded. Several shots were heard.

Moldavian President Mircha Snegur, in Moscow for a session of the Federation Council, ordered the prime minister to withdraw the police and volunteers.

Meanwhile, at least 2,000 workers formed units to help Dubossary residents.

Six people were killed and 30 wounded in fighting that raged between the village of Lunga and Dubossary. Deputy Dubossary Mayor Aleksandr Porojan told TASS by telephone at 19:30 Moscow time today.

His report was confirmed by the Soviet Interior Ministry press centre temporarily set up in the city of Komrat.

Tensions Reach 'New Highs'

LD0211184690 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 2 TASS—Tensions reached new highs in Moldavia today following rumours that elections to the parliament of the Dnester republic would be brought forward from November 25 to November 4.

"Moldavian police units are trying to break into the city. They have opened fire and used truncheons and tear gas. The local police are not interfering," Alexei Butalovich, chief of Dnester republic workers' units, said in a telephone interview from the city of Dubossary.

A duty officer in the Moldavian Interior Ministry told the MOLDOVA-PRESS news agency in Kishinev: "Republican police units were ordered to enter Dubossary today to control the situation. The regional executive committee, the city court, the prosecutor's office and other offices have been picketed since morning."

"About 6,000 local residents confronted police units, blocking access to the city. In ensuing clashes between police and workers' units only blank ammunition was used. The police also used rubber truncheons. Six people were injured with truncheons. They have been hospitalised," he said.

Situation Remains Tense

LD0311110790 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT
3 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Fedor Angeliy]

[Text] Kishinev, November 3 TASS—The situation in Eastern Moldavia, where a state of emergency was declared on Friday, remains tense.

Earlier, this area, which is populated predominantly by ethnic Russians, announced its independence from Moldavia and the establishment of the Dnestr Republic. The Moldavian parliament ruled this move unconstitutional.

According to preliminary reports that were later confirmed at a provisional press centre of the Soviet Interior Ministry in Komrat, six people were killed and 30 injured in armed clashes near the city of Dubossary.

Communications with Dubossary have been cut off. Law enforcement bodies refuse to give interviews.

Officials from local councils of Bendery, Tiraspol, Rybnitsa and Dubossary told reporters that the entire male population of these cities had rallied to defence.

Dubossary City Council Deputy Vyacheslav Sipchenko said that many people received bullet wounds. Many, clubbed by Moldavian policemen, were taken to hospital with broken arms and legs.

Workers' detachments from Tiraspol, numbering more than 4,000 people, are now in Dubossary, Grigoropol and Bendery. Another 6,500 members of these detachments are on alert in Tiraspol.

All entrances to Bendery are being guarded by volunteer groups, set up at enterprises by the decision of the City Council.

Vyacheslav Rasskazov from Bendery's Communist Party Committee said groups of people had been spotted on the city's outskirts last night, who were concentrating along roads, without approaching the city.

Mourning has been declared in all cities and villages in Eastern Moldavia, where more than 700,000 people live. All flags are flying at half-mast there.

The population of those areas has asked the Soviet leadership to send Interior Ministry troops there, officials from local councils told TASS.

The local authorities in those areas have met this morning to consider economic sanctions against Kishinev—cutting off electricity supplies and railway traffic to the Moldavian capital.

Kostash Denies Militia Used Weapons

LD0311141190 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT
3 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev November 3 TASS—Moldavian Interior Minister Ion Kostash described the reports that militia used weapons in clashes in the area of the city of Dubossary as a "provocation."

Speaking in the Moldavian parliament today, Kostash contended that information about Moldavian Interior Ministry troops shooting at people "does not correspond to reality and demands verification."

According to Kostash, he received the assignment to unblock the bridge across the Dniester from Moldavian Prime Minister Mircha Druk personally. It was said that if the bridge was not unblocked in half an hour, the question of Kostash's further holding of the interior minister office would be put to Parliament.

According to Kostash's version, a group composed of militia units was formed to fulfil the assignment. "The group was ordered to carry out the operation without using weapons, except warning shots into the sky."

"Militants who blocked the bridge used barbaric methods—lances, crow-bars and stones," Kostash said. "A huge crowd of people attacked militiamen, using even petrol bombs."

Kostash said he was ordered not to bring matters to a conflict but to withdraw outside the city. "In moving out, militiamen fired one warning shot. There were no other shots in the city." After that, Kostash said he ordered militia detachments to withdraw behind the Dniester where they are staying now.

Deputy Demands Druk's Resignation

LD0311172990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1530 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Here is a report on the situation on Moldova. The republic's Supreme Soviet has honored the memory of the victims of the tragic events which occurred in the area of Dubossary yesterday. According to the Moldovan procurator, three people died there and nine have been injured, two of them seriously. Following the reports presented to the legislature by the republic's interior minister, the KGB chairman, the republic's procurator, the chairman of the government military department, and the chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet standing commission for combatting crime, a great deal is still not fully clear. The legislature decided to set up a commission to investigate all the circumstances.

Believing that the main blame for everything that has occurred lies on the head of the Moldovan government, people's Deputy Bogdanov demanded Mircha Druk's resignation, and declared from the rostrum of the session that he intends to go on politically-motivated hunger strike without leaving the building of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet.

Shatalin Discusses Troops' Use

LD0311180190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Interview with Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of

the Interior, by S. Milyanchikov; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Milyanchikov] This is Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of the Interior. After the adoption of the decision to introduce Internal Troops units into Moldova, he directed actions on the spot. A few days ago, because of disagreements with the republican leadership and the Interior Ministry of Moldova, he was obliged to return to Moscow. But the Internal Troops have remained on the territory of the republic. So what is today's state of affairs?

[Shatalin] Yesterday, after the return of volunteer detachments from the Dnestr region, from the Gagauz area where they had been, they reached Dubossary and organized a rally in the square calling for the staff of the main law enforcement bodies to be replaced, to be reelected. In response to this Comrade Kostash, Moldova's interior minister, decided to send about 300 people, militia employees, to the Dubossary militia school. As a result of the ensuing clash at an intersection on the left bank six people were killed and several people—16—were injured, nine receiving gunshot wounds.

This has very seriously aggravated the present situation on the left bank. A state of emergency has been declared by the Interim Committee of the Left Bank in Tiraspol, Bendery, Dubossary, and Rybnitsa. People's militia groups are being formed and defensive lines are being established around these towns. The opposing side has also been joined by so-called volunteer helpers and the law enforcement bodies.

The situation is very complex. Further interethnic clashes are possible. Once we had achieved some degree of success in averting similar conflict in the Gagauz area and were able, in time, to interpose ourselves between the contending sides, demonstrating resolve and averting conflict, we did not anticipate that the forces concentrated there, once they had withdrawn, would be encountered again at the Dnestr River. Internal Troops are now being prepared, and I believe that in the next few hours we shall dispatch additional forces if assent to that is forthcoming from the leadership of Moldova and a decision is made by the country's leadership. This is being prepared.

[Milyanchikov] As I understand it, it was a justifiable step to draft Internal Troops into the territory of Moldova, and this has had a positive result.

[Shatalin] I believe so because the Gagauz example is clear evidence of this. The fact that we did not draft troops into the Dnestr region or into the border area has already led to conflict, as you can see. We were aware that there was a difficult situation there, but we did not decide or determine when to send in troops, or how many to send in, or to where. Above all, it was the leaders of these republics who blocked this.

[Milyanchikov] Now the relationship, the interaction between the leaders of Moldavia and the leaders of the Internal Troops which have been sent—is there any mutual understanding?

[Shatalin] There is a degree of interaction, but there is no mutual understanding. Why? Mainly because the leaders of the republic, first and foremost Comrade Kostash, the minister of internal affairs, at every turn have insisted that the forces of the Internal Troops impose a curfew in the Gagauz area, abolish the existing bodies of government, impose censorship and various restrictions on travel as stipulated under the curfew. But there was absolutely no need for this because there were no illegal activities in the Gagauz areas, those areas where the Gagauz people live. The situation was calm and conducive to the holding of talks.

The second stage of the talks, which were held in my presence in Komrat, offered hope for the stabilization of the situation because it was unanimously accepted by both sides, by the leadership of the republic in Kishinev and by the newly elected, so-called Gagauz committee; they were wholly agreeable to a 10-day moratorium.

Moldavian Legislature Views Unrest

LD0311170590 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT
3 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 3 TASS—The Moldavian parliament is hearing today information about the tragic developments in the city of Dubossary on November 2.

The Moldavian interior minister said in his report: "A column of workers' detachments from Grigoriopol and Tiraspol, moving in 32 buses towards Dubossary to support local separatists, was stopped by Moldavian militia units on the bridge in the village of Vadul-Lui-Vode. They were warned that if they made an attempt to continue their advance towards Dubossary, weapons would be used against them."

"In response the militia units were told that the detachments also had weapons and munitions and they did not recommend to use weapons against them," Ion Kostash stressed.

The minister told the parliament that he had received a telegram from the Soviet Interior Ministry, which said: "In connection with the utmost aggravation of the situation in the Dnestr region of Moldavia, which resulted in the loss of life and injuries, the Soviet Interior Ministry asks for permission, with the aim to stabilize the situation, to move Interior Ministry troops to Tiraspol, Dubossary, Rybnitsa and other areas, which the Moldavian parliament and government find necessary to add to this list." Although the experience of the use of Interior Ministry troops in the south of Moldavia can be assessed in various ways, this step permits to avoid

bloodshed, Ion Kostash continued. He urged the legislators to consider carefully all possible consequences of this step.

"I, as a minister of the Union-republican subordination, was ordered to withdraw immediately republican militia units from the area of the Dniestr River, Bendery, Rybnitsa and Kaushan, in order to avoid the worsening of the situation. To take all measures to ensure also the withdrawal of volunteer detachments from those areas," Kostash told the republican parliament.

Gorbachev Meets With Snegur

PM311220590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
Second Edition 4 Nov 90 page 1

[Text] "In connection with the sharp deterioration of the situation in the Moldova [Moldavia] Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR; A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, had a meeting on 3 November with M.I. Snegur, president of the Moldova SSR; I.D. Khodyrke, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova SSR; and with People's Deputies S.N. Topal, I.N. Smirnov, K.P. Taushandzhi, I.T. Mitskul, and M.N. Laur representing the Gagauz population and the population of the areas adjoining the Dnestr. The meeting took place at the latter's request.

Serious alarm was expressed at the tragic events in the town of Dubossary and at the deterioration of the situation in the towns of Komrat, Tiraspol, and a number of other population centers in the republic. The participants in the meeting were unanimous in stating that immediate measures are needed to restore law and order, to put a decisive stop to all actions aimed at exacerbating the situation and inciting conflict among the people. The present situation can only be resolved if the Soviet Constitution and the constitution of the Moldova SSR are rigorously observed, they stated.

The participants in the meeting agreed that the present situation in the republic requires immediate, coordinated actions on the part of all interested sides, and the adoption of essential measures which will remove the actual causes of the present tension.

In the common view, the way out of the conflict situation lies in establishing moratoria on all decisions previously taken by the sides that led to conflicts, and in declaring illegal and immediately dissolving volunteer formations created either by the government of the republic or by the population of the Dnestr area and the rayons densely populated by the Gagauz.

Those taking part in the meeting reached the conclusion that it is essential to set up a conciliation commission without delay and to begin working out mutually acceptable solutions, working from the fact that the way to peace in this region lies in preserving the integrity of Moldova within the USSR; in unconditionally observing

the human rights of any nationality; and in taking into account the interests of Moldovans, Russians, Ukrainians, Gagauz, Bulgarians, and representatives of all the peoples who inhabit the republic. Attempts to dismember the Union and the republic lead nowhere. It was stressed unanimously that the individuals guilty of fanning the conflict and of inciting fratricidal clashes should, irrespective of their official or public position, be brought to the most rigorous accountability. Appropriate instructions have been given to the USSR Procuracy and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The leadership of the Republic of Moldova have been asked to move swiftly to discuss and resolve the social and economic problems that have accumulated in these regions; to ensure that there is fair representation; of all nationalities in the structures of power, administrative bodies, and public organizations; and to create proper guarantees for this.

The Soviet state leadership, while expressing their profound condolences to the families of those killed and those wounded, underlined that they will take the most resolute measures to put a stop to any kind of illegal actions which may lead to the flaring up of national intolerance and discord, and bring to strict account those leaders who should take all the responsibility for the situation in the affected republics and regions.

Snegur Briefs Legislature on Talks

LD0411123190 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT
4 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 4 TASS—"Everything possible should be done to stop processes that could lead to the imposition of a state of emergency in all Moldova [Moldavia]." Moldavian President Mircha Snegur told the Republican Parliament today, commenting on his meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"Mikhail Gorbachev blankly supported a united, whole and indivisible Moldova. I believe the Moldovan parliament could now annul its decision on the Gagauz autonomy and the sacking of several people's deputies," Snegur said.

Common sense should prevail in the current situation to prevent a war, those present at talks with Gorbachev agreed, Snegur said.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov sharply criticized the Moldovan Government, Snegur said.

"I suggested imposing a moratorium on the recent decision by the Moldavian parliament and the unconstitutional declaration of independence by the so-called Gagauz and Dnestr Republics. Representatives of the Dnestr regions said the republic had passed several discriminatory laws," he said.

Snegur called for the setting up of conciliatory commissions to conduct talks with Gagauz and Dnestr leaders. A zero option is required for this, he said.

Snegur called on Moldavians to remain calm and not to give in to provocations.

Separatism cannot help tackle current problems, lawmakers stressed.

After hearing reports by the president and first deputy chairman of the parliament, the legislature adjourned to prepare a draft resolution aimed to stabilise the situation.

Deputies Demand Bakatin's Resignation

LD0311184490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1731 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Boris Sverev]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—In connection with the situation in Moldova [Moldavia], a group of USSR people's deputies appealed today to Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, demanding the "immediate resignation" of Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, "as having promoted the creation and the arming of the voluntary formations of Moldova."

As is well known, a state of emergency has been declared in the towns of Dubossary, Tiraspol, and Bendery, situated on the banks of the Dnestr. The Russian-speaking population, which previously announced the creation of the Dnestr Republic within the USSR, predominates in this area of eastern Moldova. The legislature of Moldova in turn assessed this decision as unconstitutional. Rumors that elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Republic were to be moved from 25 October to 4 November have caused a deterioration in the situation, and armed clashes have lead to human casualties.

As Viktor Alksnis, USSR people's deputy, told TASS in the latter half of the day, he and a number of other deputies—including Yuriy Blokhin, Yevgeniy Kogan, and Nikolay Petrushenko—met the USSR president and handed him a statement on the development of events in Moldova.

The deputies demanded "energetic actions in defense of the constitutional rights of Soviet citizens." In the event of measures not being taken, they intend "to raise the question of the convocation of an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies and of posing to it the question of confidence in Mikhail Gorbachev as president of the USSR."

USSR Supreme Soviet chairman and Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet government, took part in the meeting.

Viktor Alksnis also reported that deputies, members of the Soyuz deputy's group, who met the Soviet president had not received authority from the group for today's action and acted only on their own behalf.

'Tragic Events' Examined

LD0311211490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1845 GMT 3 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Colya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 3 Nov (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] honored with a minute's silence the memory of the victims of the tragic events that took place on Friday in the area of Dubossary. According to data of the procuracy of the republic, three people died there and nine were injured, including two who were seriously injured. Deputies heard a report from Mircha Druk, prime minister of the republic, on the situation in the rayons of the left bank of the Dnestr and the adjacent territory. His proposal on using resources contributed by the inhabitants of Moldova to support the voluntary formations with technological equipment and to arm the militia and the police force, which will be formed after a decision made earlier by legislature, was adopted.

At the same time, the legislature made a decision aimed at stabilizing the explosive sociopolitical situation. It provides for the withdrawal of all voluntary formations from the southern rayons and from the Dnestr regions of Moldova, and also for the banning of USSR Interior Ministry troops from rayons on the left bank of the Dnestr. Five deputies' groups have been formed to supervise the implementation of this decision.

A legislative commission for detailed research into the incidents that took place on the 2 September in the region of Dubossary has also been formed.

After this, the legislature discussed and approved the new draft coat-of-arms for Moldova. Appropriate changes were made to the republic's constitution. The new coat-of-arms of the Moldovan SSR is comprised of an eagle with spread wings, symbolizing the Romantic origin of the Moldovan people. In its beak is a cross, and below the beak is an olive branch. The adoption of a new coat-of-arms is intended to reduce tension in society and end claims about the identical nature of the Moldovan and Romanian flags.

Considering that the main culprit for the tragedy was the head of the Moldovan government, People's Deputy Georgiy Bogdanov demanded the resignation of Mircha Druk and announced from the session's rostrum a political hunger strike which he is intending to observe without leaving the building of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet. The session adjourned its work until tomorrow.

MVD Deputy Minister Comments

PM0511160790 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 4 Nov 90 p 1

[Interview with S. Lisauskas, USSR deputy internal affairs minister, by A. Nadzharov; place and date not given: "Before It Is Too Late: On the Situation in the Moldovan SSR"]

[Text] The basis of the present conflict in Moldova lies not so much in the national sphere as in the political sphere. That is the opinion of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD].

"This proposition," said S. Lisauskas, USSR deputy internal affairs minister, "is also confirmed by the fact that militia forces in Moldova have been removed from local soviet jurisdiction. In the present situation, they—those soviets—would like armed protection of course.

[Nadzharov] But how then do you view the formation of numerous volunteer groups?

[Lisauskas] As the republic leadership's fatal mistake. But for those formations the conflict could have been settled quite quickly and would not have had such grave consequences.

[Nadzharov] Are there precise figures for casualties incurred during the clashes in the region of Dubossary?

[Lisauskas] No precise figures yet. According to our data, three people died during the clashes on 2 November and one died in hospital. Twenty people were injured.

[Nadzharov] Could you tell us briefly how the armed clashes began.

[Lisauskas] As these things have usually started recently—for political reasons. Once again it was a question of taking power. Four-fifths of Dubossarskiy Rayon's population are Russian speakers. However, as some local inhabitants assert, the overwhelming majority of leaders are Moldavian. On 2 November an excited crowd approached the law-enforcement organs' buildings to "restore justice." At the same time a reinforcement was approaching from Kishinev—a unit from the patrol and sentry duty, the training center, and the militia school. By midday a situation had developed which is popularly known as a "brawl." An investigation will have to determine who attacked first and who fired the shots.

[Nadzharov] Stasis Genrikovich, what you are saying does not seem very precise or definite. Perhaps you simply do not have sufficient information?

[Lisauskas] We have too much and too little at the same time. We are receiving reports from both sides. But who can vouch for their accuracy? And it is hard to double-check since some people in Kishinev are constantly interrupting the telephone link between Moscow and Dubossary, however there are still the army's radio stations.

There is another important detail. You must understand that any careless talk can cost lives, whether from my side or yours. I hope that RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA's readers will understand me well.

[Nadzharov] What is the Army's role in this conflict?

[Lisauskas] Well, what can it be when a state of emergency has not been declared? According to the law the troops cannot intervene in this situation.

[Nadzharov] How did events in the Dnestr rayons develop Saturday morning? What happened in Kishinev?

[Lisauskas] According to the information available at 1200 hours, it was relatively quiet in the Moldovan capital. Volunteers were approaching rayons of the Dnestr region, however. Forces were continuing to gather from the other direction. The USSR MVD has been trying to convince the participants in the unrest that this path leads to further bloodshed, if not to civil war. Of course the conflict must be resolved by political methods.

[Nadzharov] What is the latest report you have received from the conflict region?

[Lisauskas] An alarming one. It has been reported that women and children in Tiraspol are turning to military units for protection.

In conclusion, deputy internal affairs minister Lisauskas reported that a USSR MVD operations group headed by deputy minister V. Trushin flew out from Moscow to Moldova at 1400 hours to study the situation and give practical help.

As the editorial office has learned, Moldovan Prime Minister Druk has received a proposal on the introduction of internal troops into the conflict region. On a previous occasion, according to MVD officials, the reaction to that proposal had been sharply negative.

It is likely that the Moldovan leadership is hoping to resolve the conflict by means of its own armed formations organized under the republic government's Resolution No. 407 of 23 October 1990. According to that document, the republic's recently formed military department is instructed to create people's volunteer units and coordinate their actions. The previous units of this type, which were under local soviet jurisdiction, have been disbanded.

It emerges from the latest reports from Kishinev that a mob of around 3,000 people is roaming the city. The main slogan—Moscow must remember Moldovan sovereignty.

But it should also be remembered that sovereignty implies responsibility. Including for the lives of people, whatever their nationality.

The situation can still be saved by the talks which were in progress at the highest level on Saturday. IAN reports that a media statement [vystupleniye v pechati] is expected from M. Gorbachev.

Leader Views Current Issues

LD0411113890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1030 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS and TASS correspondents from Kishinev]

[Text] Mircha Snegur, president of the Moldova [Moldavia] Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], has said that the main conclusion of his meeting with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev was concerned with the need to do everything possible to halt the processes which could lead to the introduction of a state of emergency in the whole of Moldova. Speaking in the republic's legislature he noted the expediency of creating conciliation commissions to hold talks with representatives of the Gagauz people and the inhabitants of the Dnestr area. But the zero variant is necessary for this, entailing not only the annulling of the elections held in the southern rayons, but also of the anti-constitutional proclamations of the so-called Gagauz and Dnestr republics. A re-examination of some of the Moldovan Parliament's recently adopted decisions is also possible.

Today in the Dnestr area the law on the state language is practically inoperative, Ion Khadyrke, first deputy [chairman] of the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet said. For this reason it will probably be expedient to postpone the dates for introducing its operation on the left bank of the Dnestr and also in the southern rayons of Moldova.

The legislators' speeches stressed more than once that separatism must not in any event become a method of solving the problems which have arisen. It is necessary to seek agreement and remove the confrontation between people only on an equal footing.

Having heard the reports of the president and the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the legislative sitting adjourned its work once more. During this two-hour interval and sitting's draft decision aimed at stabilizing the situation is to be drawn up.

Yeltsin Sends Legislators to Area

LD0411181390 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT
4 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 4 TASS—In response to an appeal of representatives of the Russian-speaking population of Moldavia to the Russian Supreme Soviet and on the basis of a bilateral treaty that envisages the equality of all citizens of the sovereign republics, their social and material protection, a Russian parliamentary delegation has been sent to Moldavia on the instruction of Boris Yeltsin. It will analyse the situation there and, if possible, will resolve the existing problems jointly with representatives of the Moldavian parliament.

Further Report on Situation

LD0411210790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent A. Barkhatov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Hello comrades. We are of course concerned, first and foremost, by the situation in Moldova [Moldavia]. What is going on there today? Has the situation changed since yesterday's meeting between the USSR president and representatives of the republic? A TASS correspondent reports that after the withdrawal of various formations on both sides, the situation in the Dnestr region has stabilized somewhat. The night passed calmly, as you can see, phrased in extremely cautious terms. Our special correspondent reports from Dubossarskiy Rayon in Moldova.

[Barkhatov] From the Kishinev side, practically all volunteer units have been removed from the bridge over the Dnestr. The situation is being monitored by the Moldova militia. In the town of Dubossary nervous tension has not decreased, partly because the republican and central media have been publishing at times the most contradictory information about the barricaded town and the aftermath of the well-known tragic events here. [passage omitted]

Hundreds of Dubossary women and children are presently billeted with the troop unit—according to the last report, 853 people. Regarding some reports about the unit's possible involvement in the sorrowful events of 2 November....

[M. Kh. Safarov, deputy commander for political affairs] I would like to say that certain forces want to switch responsibility from themselves on to the Army, although you see full well how the Army relates to the population. [passage omitted]

[Barkhatov] The staff of the voluntary people's patrols works around the clock in the city soviet.

[V.A. Finagin, chairman of the Dubossary City Soviet] Starting this afternoon, we have released a certain number of volunteers from Rybnitsa and Tiraspol.

[Barkhatov] Is this the start of a general process, or....

[Finagin] It is the start of a general process, in light of those decisions adopted by the parliament of the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and also by a TASS report on the meeting between Gorbachev and Snegur, Smirnov and Topal.

[Barkhatov] Are you in communication with the other side of the Dnestr? That is, if something arises, some kind of misunderstanding, are you able to settle it by using a telephone?

[Finagin] Up to now we have had no communications with Kishinev, nor the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet, nor with the Moldova SSR government.

[Barkhatov] That is, in practical terms, if something else were to occur then....

[Finagin] In practical terms we will....

[Barkhatov] ...the situation could not even be settled in good time?

[Finagin] Yes, absolutely... it would absolutely impossible to settle things.

[Announcer] In connection with an appeal from representatives of the Russian-speaking population of the Moldovan republic to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and based on the bilateral treaty envisaging the equal rights of all citizens of sovereign republics and their social and material protection, a Russian legislative delegation has, on the instruction of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, been dispatched to Moldova to study the situation and possible resolution, jointly with representatives of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldovan republic, on the problems which have arisen.

Stabilization Measures Adopted

LD0411194490 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT
4 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 4 TASS—The Moldavian [Moldavian] parliament heard today a report of Moldavian President Mircha Snegur and first deputy chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet Ion Khadyrke. It adopted a resolution aimed at the stabilisation of the socio-political situation. It provides for the disbandment of all volunteer formations and so-called workers' self-defense detachments, as well as other units not envisaged by the law, the elimination of their check points, fortifications and other obstructions within 24 hours. Law-enforcement agencies are to ensure the confiscation of fire arms and cold steel, explosives and other similar materials, as well as technical facilities that these units have at their disposal.

The parliament set up a conciliatory commission for conducting a dialogue with representatives of the Gagauz population and residents of the Dnester region. The parliament suggested that they nominate their candidates for conducting a constructive dialogue. By the majority of votes, Petr Luchinsky, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party, was elected chairman of the conciliatory commission for the sides of the Moldavian parliament. The parliament found it necessary for representatives of the Soviet parliament to take part in the work of the commission as observers.

The resolution recommends mass media organs to promote the stabilisation of the socio-political situation in

the republic and to prevent the publication and broadcasting of materials that can kindle inter-ethnic strife. It was recommended to journalists covering the developments in the republic to avoid insults and unjustified accusations, to devote special attention to processes of the establishment of civil peace and accord. The resolution came into force immediately after its adoption.

Parliamentarians approved the composition of the commission, which is to find out the cause of the incidents, that took place in the area of Dubossary on November 2. The parliament sent condolences to the families of those who were killed in those clashes.

The Moldavian parliament ratified the Soviet law on criminal responsibility for the blocking of railways and other transport routes.

Deputy Georgiy Bogdanov, who declared a hunger strike in parliament on Saturday, said that it was not expedient to continue it.

The fifth autumn session of the Moldavian parliament interrupted its work until November 12. During the forthcoming days deputies will work in recently formed commissions for the stabilisation of the socio-political situation and in permanent parliament commissions.

Militia Accused of Random Shooting

LD0511122190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0930 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Interview with unnamed officials by correspondent A. Barkhatov in Dubossarskiy rayon, Moldova; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Barkhatov] Tell me, please, I have just one question for you. Are you the chief of the division, the commander?

[Unidentified speaker] The commander, yes.

[Barkhatov] Tell me please, has there been anything involving you—your internal affairs division—that could be described as a pogrom?

[Speaker] No, no, there has been nothing.

[Barkhatov] Have you heard the reports that there was such an incident?

[Speaker] I have.

[Barkhatov] How can you explain that?

[Speaker] I do not know. Perhaps incorrect reporting.

[Unidentified medical official] This is the bullet which was extracted from [words indistinct].

[Barkhatov] The flattened bullet....

[Medic] Flattened, yes. I do not know [words indistinct] A second piece of shrapnel was removed from the right hip.

[Barkhatov] Was that from a bullet, too?

[Medic] Yes, from a bullet.

[Barkhatov] In all then, 14 were wounded by bullets, by shooting?

[Medic] Yes, that is right, and three who were lost to us.

[Barkhatov] Three killed. These were bullet wounds? [video shows medic nodding in agreement]

[P.P. Golovko, a Dubossary city soviet deputy] They fired without mercy, without mercy. About fifteen of them.

[Barkhatov] In militia uniform?

[Golovko] All in militia uniform. All in militia uniform. And beside me (one lad Anatoliy) was mown down. I saw him. I worked with him. He clutched at his stomach. I turned and ran back to help him, and I got a bullet in my back. [passage omitted]

Army Role Deemed 'Constructive'

LD0511134690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 5 Nov 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] To judge by all accounts, the situation in Moldova has improved. Following the tragedy on 2 November in Dubossary in which at least six people were killed, various forces of the republic have begun to be aware of their responsibility to people. The Moldovan president has finally called for the immediate disbanding of all so-called volunteer detachments. Yesterday the Moldovan parliament set up a conciliation commission for negotiations with the Gagauzes and inhabitants of the left bank of the Dnestr. A delegation of the Russian parliament has been dispatched to Moldova. As far as the role of the army detachments in the Dnestr region is concerned, according to our information, it is deemed constructive.

Let us hope that by the end of the day the course of events in the republic will not change in any sudden or drastic way.

Conciliation Commission Visits Tiraspol

LD0511154190 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 5 TASS—The Conciliation Commission set up by the Moldovan [Moldavian] Parliament went to Tiraspol today to discuss the normalization of the social and political situation with representatives of the Dniester population.

"We have a package of constructive proposals and hope that we shall find a common language with representatives of the Dniester and Gagauz population," Petr Luchinskiy, chairman of the Conciliation Commission and Moldovan Communist Party leader, told republican television.

"They should also change their position and review some of their decisions," he continued. "They should abolish, above all, the so-called republics, elections and their results.

"All Moldovan residents are interested in this outcome, otherwise, we shall face confrontation and a further escalation of the conflict. Our commission will do its best to normalise the situation and to establish civil peace and concord on Moldovan soil."

The Moldovan parliament adopted a decision on Sunday to disband all volunteer units and other detachments not provided for by law.

According to reports from Tiraspol, workers' self-defence detachments have yet to be disbanded. Their check points at entrances to the city have not been removed.

Local activists continue the campaign for elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Dnester republic, which was ruled unconstitutional by the Moldovan Parliament.

'Coupon' Distribution for Goods in Ukraine

914D0028A Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 Oct 90 p 2

[Article by A. Bityuk, department head of KOMSO-MOLSKOYE ZNAMYA: "Kiev-Style Reform"]

[Text] For several days unprecedented speculative buying has reigned around trade institutions and the State Bank in the Ukraine. The food stores are being thronged, and even goods that were ignored previously are in unusual demand.

There is nothing at all to buy in the department stores: They have been closed for inventory, and they will only open on 1 November when a coupon system for distribution of goods will be introduced in the Ukraine.

This fact became known only quite recently after UKRINFORM disseminated an interview with V.P. Fokin, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and chairman of the Ukrainian State Committee on Economics. He was commenting on the Ukrainian Council of Ministers decree "On the Defense of the Consumer Market in the Ukrainian SSR." The essence of the innovations consists of the following: On 1 November the sale of goods and nonfood goods, as well as industrial and technical commodities, will take place using a special consumer card with coupons. The consumer cards with the coupons will be handed out to all working citizens as well as to retirees, invalids, and students and trainees at technical secondary schools and vocational training institutions

once per month when they are paid their wages. The cards will be distributed for only the 70 percent of the total wages that remains after taxes and other obligatory deductions.

For wages up to 70 rubles [R] per month, the consumer card contains 50 coupons irrespective of the size of the wage. For a wage that exceeds R800, coupons are not offered at all. On the other hand, in this range the decree makes exceptions for wages paid for livestock turned over to the state, agricultural products, and raw materials.

The coupons that make up the card will only be valid on the territory of the Ukraine. Only luxury goods may be sold in the republic without them, particularly furniture, motorcycles, video recorders, radios, musical instruments, rugs, cars, jewelry, prefabricated houses along with all their components, and other goods costing more than R1,500. But all these items will not be sold for cash either; only checks from the State Bank may be used, and only by residents of the republic. The cards are not necessary for purchasing goods at public dining enterprises, book stores, "Soyuzpechat" [Union press] newsstands, commercial and commission stores that sell nonfood goods, drugstores, and auctions....

Inasmuch as no one knew of the decree, the interview with V.P. Fokin came like a bolt out of the blue and resulted in a run on the stores.

On Monday, the leaders of the republic's ministries and departments offered more information on this matter at a news conference. They cited the need to balance the republic's market; they asserted that R3 of cash are purchasing R1 of goods on the market. But it remained unclear why only one remedy was chosen—to limit the purchasing ability of the population and freeze the money accumulated by the people.

And who can guarantee that this purely administrative bridle on distribution will not turn into new widespread abuses and will not engender new ties of corruption?

Ukraine Adopts Plan for Economic Independence

LD0211213390 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Report by UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev November 2—The plan for the Ukraine's transition to a market economy has been determined by the Ukrainian parliament after heated debates. Deputies adopted in the main the government plan for actions in conditions of "the Ukraine's complete economic and political independence."

In the report to the session acting Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin said that the republic's consumer market has been fully destabilised. He believes that a real alternative is "the Ukraine's complete economic and political independence and transition to a market

economy with profound constitutional changes." Regrettably these obligatory conditions are not taken into account in the corresponding Union programmes, the speaker said.

After completing the preparatory stage, the government plans, first of all, to set in motion the mechanism of social protection of the population and to begin privatisation of property. The programme envisages the issuing of national currency, the transition to a free price formation and freedom of enterprise with using "the main levers of state regulation." Some 5-7 thousand industrial enterprises and some 150,000 trading enterprises are to be denationalised. A part of state-owned food stores and small enterprises will become privately-owned. All citizens who want so will be given plots of land for farming as inherited possessions for life or can lease plots of land for up to 50 years.

It is emphasised that the Ukraine should enter the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other international organisations. The government believes that this will help enhance the confidence of foreign partners and attract more hard currency to stabilise the republic's economy.

Ukraine Opposition To Hamper 7 Nov Celebrations

LD0511074190 Moscow Domestic Servicew in Russian
0700 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] What will the October Revolution celebration be like in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital? By a decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet, a ceremonial meeting will be held on the eve in the Palace of the Ukraine.

The opposition in the Supreme Soviet, however, has called on deputies to cancel the military parades in Kiev and throughout the republic. A group of opposition parties and Rukh have declared that they will undertake extensive measures to hamper the military parade on Kreshchatik, the city's main street.

The Kiev procurator has warned that any such actions will be considered unlawful, with all the ramifications this entails.

Workers Support Celebrations

LD0211160690 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT
2 Nov 90

[Report by UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev October 2 TASS—The Presidium of the Ukrainian Workers' for Socialist Perestroika, a mass organisation uniting workers from many Ukrainian enterprises, supported the desire of working people to celebrate the 73rd anniversary of the October Revolution.

On November 7 they intend to stage rallies and meetings of working people to strengthening unity of action, understanding, discipline and the preservation of the USSR's integrity. The Presidium also approved proposals that workers from nearby regions participate in the festive march in Kiev.

The Presidium called on the Kiev City Council, the Rukh organization and republican law enforcement bodies to take preventive measures to maintain law and order during the holiday demonstration.

The appeal says that the Presidium has information that extremist organizations plan to hold women's sit-ins on November 7 to bar the way to marchers.

Meanwhile, the Kiev City Council has been debating the celebration of the October Revolution anniversary for several days. Deputies expressed various opinions. Some suggest that a military parade and a demonstration be held.

Others resolutely oppose the parade. Still others are against any parade and demonstration. Failing to achieve a consensus, Kiev Mayor Arnold Nazarchuk resigned.

Ukrainian Orthodox Patriarch Visits Kiev

91UN0158A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by S. Tsikora: "A Struggle for the Parishioners' Souls"]

[Text] Mstislav, Patriarch of Kiev and of the Entire Ukraine, the head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which is presently being restored, has arrived in Kiev from abroad.

With his arrival, the religious situation in this republic has experienced some significant changes. There are now three churches—the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and in the Western portion of this republic, the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church—which lay claim to the role of the people's chief spiritual pastors.

From the standpoint of religious doctrine or dogma, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church differs little from the Russian Orthodox Church. To be sure, one conducts its preaching in Ukrainian, while the other does so in Russian; the Exarchate is subordinate to the Patriarch of Moscow, whereas the members of the Autocephalous Church acknowledge only the authority of the Patriarch of the Entire Ukraine. And as to the number of parishes, here the forces differ notably. As of today, the absolute majority of churches functioning in this republic belong to the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Autocephalists still have only a few church units, but with regard to an increase in the number of parishioners, they are clearly outstripping the Exarchate's parishes. This fact is to be explained by the

awakening of the people's national self-awareness and by the elevation of Ukrainian to the rank of the official state language.

Far from the last role in forming the attitude of the native population toward the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church is being played by its history, the first pages of which were "written" by the Grand Prince of Kiev, Vladimir the Baptizer. It is considered that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was independent until 1696, when it was made subordinate to the Moscow Patriarchate. In 1921 it proclaimed its independence from Moscow anew, but as early as 1930 it was banned by the Stalinist regime. It was then, according to an assertion by this republic's press, that 27 bishops and approximately 1500 clergymen were repressed.

The present-day head of the Ukrainian Church, Patriarch Mstislav, escaped or avoided the fate of the repressed clergymen only because he was living in Poland at that time. The NKVD would hardly have pardoned him for several reasons: his former Cossack officer rank, his kinship with Petliura (nephew), and the fact that he was elected to the Polish parliament from among the Ukrainian population then living on Poland's territory.

Nor did Mstislav enjoy favor on the part of Hitler's henchmen during the Fascist occupation of the Ukraine: this bishop spent six months in the prisons of Chernigov and Priluk. After the war he traveled across the Atlantic Ocean and, in time, was elected head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church on the American Continent, and then in Europe and Australia as well. His permanent residence is located in the small town of Bound Brook, New Jersey.

Kiev welcomed the 92-year-old patriarch with a considerable outpouring of people along the route followed by the motorcade from the airport. He was accorded the opportunity of saying a prayer of thanksgiving in the main cathedral of Kievan Rus—St. Sophia Cathedral, where services have not been held since the postwar period. Such an honor has not been granted to a single church figure in Kiev during the last few decades.

Patriarch Mstislav will spend about a month in the Ukraine, visit his native birthplace of Poltava, as well as several cities in the eastern and western parts of the republic, and he will take part in a session of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church Synod. And as to the question of his moving to take up permanent residence in Kiev, the patriarch stated at a press conference that this question still remains open.

Moreover, at the end of this week a visit to Kiev has been planned for Aleksey II, the Patriarch of Moscow and Entire Russia. I was told in the Ukrainian Exarchate that the principal purpose of his visit here is to accord a new status to the Ukrainian Exarchate. As to the question of a possible meeting between the two Orthodox patriarchs, the Exarchate declined to reply.

Shirkovskiy Confirmed as Belorussian KGB Chief
LD0311174590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1530 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Deputies of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet have confirmed the chairman of the republic's Committee for State Security. Kebich, chairman of the Council of Ministers, proposed Shirkovskiy's candidature for this post. Shirkovskiy was the first deputy chairman of the republic's KGB. Two-hundred-twenty-five deputies voted for him—only five were against while eight abstained.

Eduard Ivanovich Shirkovskiy is 58 years old and has a law degree. He has served in KGB bodies for many years. Here is a notable detail: In all the years of Soviet power, he is the first Belorussian to occupy a post like this in the republic.

Caucasus

Nagorno-Karabakh Commander Cancels 7 Nov Parade
LD0511141190 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Text] Stepanakert November 5 TASS—Commandant of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region and adjacent areas of Azerbaijan Major-General V. Safanov cancelled the November 7 demonstration to mark the October Revolution. The statement he issued says he was guided by the emergency situation law and the socio-political situation in Stepanakert.

The situation in the Nargorno-Karabakh autonomous region is, indeed, unfit for any holiday-making. Villages are still being attacked there, causing numerous casualties, hostages are being abducted and cattle rustled. Many crimes are committed by men armed with automatic weapons. An unidentified gang attacked an Army patrol on November 1 in the regional centre, capturing two submachine guns and a radio station.

Ter-Petrosyan Discusses Armenian-Turkish Ties
91US0063A Yerevan GOLOS ARMENII
in Russian 7 Oct 90 p 1

[ARMENPRESS report "from a Florens Avakyan report for the ARMENIAN MIRROR SPECTATOR": "L. Ter-Petrosyan Talks With Armenian UN Employees"]

[Text] "People and groups may have enemies, but governments, no," Levon Ter-Petrosyan, the new chairman of Armenia's legislature, declared, for the first time telling Armenians living in America that Armenia intends establishing economic relations with Turkey.

This statement was made by the Armenian president immediately upon arrival in New York on Friday, 28 September. He was welcomed in UN Headquarters by

Yasusi Akashi, aide to the UN secretary general for disarmament. The meeting had been organized by staff member Joyce Sulagian.

Following a brief ceremony, the president had a meeting lasting approximately an hour with Armenian UN employees. He was accompanied by Counselor Ambartsym Galstyan and Alik Arzumanyan, leader of the Armenian Pannational Movement Information Center. Raffi Oganessian, a representative of the "Armenian Assembly," was also a member of the group also.

Explaining the new approach toward Turkey, the president said that Armenia was becoming a country and should conduct itself as a state: "We should establish relations with all our neighbors, not forgetting our demands—concerning the genocide and the people forcibly deported from their land. But we cannot make this a political issue. We cannot change overnight the causes of the problem inasmuch as there are corresponding sentiments in both Armenia and in Turkey. This change must come about gradually."

Setting forth the process in brief, Levon Ter-Petrosyan said that the first step should be trade with Turkey, then cultural relations and, finally, political relations. "The government cannot exercise policy without the support of the people. I am sure that we are in a position to establish such relations," he said. Responding to a question by our correspondent as to whether he intended meeting with Turkish President Ozal, who is in New York currently, Levon Ter-Petrosyan said: "It was not Moscow that organized my visit. If I wish to go to Turkey, which is adjacent to us, I shall do so. Time will tell."

Speaking of the republic's independence, he declared that after 70 years this was a normal phenomenon. Even had we not declared independence, it would have been inevitable for various processes are occurring in the Soviet Union today. "Nonetheless, we have taken certain steps to bring independence closer and to be ready for it. It would be dangerous for independence to be bestowed on us and for Armenia to find itself unprepared for it," Levon Ter-Petrosyan said, citing the example of 1918, when the Armenian Republic, which lasted just 2 years, was created. In proclaiming independence, we do not intend to sever ties to the Soviet Union, he emphasized, explaining that relations, political included, are desirable not only with the central government but also with the republics. The central government still recognizes us as a political partner.

Speaking of Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Republic, he declared: "Russia and Yeltsin, with whom we have had and continue to have serious relations, are important for us. These relations will gradually expand and extend to other republics."

Concerning the misgivings of the diaspora connected with the armed groups unwilling to submit to the authorities and the possibility of Armenia becoming a new Lebanon, Levon Ter-Petrosyan said that these fears are

exaggerated: "Had the Communist regime continued to govern in Armenia just a few months more, civil war would have been inevitable. These groups emerged at a time when the Soviet Army was unable to defend Armenians. These were legitimate groups, and they did much to defend Armenians. However, he continued, these armed groups wanted to employ the same tactics to achieve political ends. The political process must unfold within the framework of democratic means. These groups did not win the support of the people, and when democratic forces came to power, the people rallied around these forces, and the groups were placed under control."

Concerning the Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh] issue, Levon Ter-Petrosyan called the people living on this territory "stubborn and resolute," emphasizing that only force could drive them out of there. Azerbaijan could not do so: "Armenians are strong enough to solve these problems themselves. We will not permit the forcible expulsion of Armenians from Artsakh. Political negotiations, not military operations, are the best solution in this region."

Levon Ter-Petrosyan went on to emphasize that the sole solution of the Artsakh question is economic, social, and cultural independence of the oblast, given its own Armenian army, with relations with all republics.

Today the situation in Armenia is stable, but the republic is encountering serious economic difficulties. Levon Ter-Petrosyan observed once again that ways to enter into economic cooperation with neighbors, Turkey and Iran included, are being sought.

"The state of communists is disintegrating, and its place is being taken by a federation, and we need to have certain guarantees and an agreement that the other republics isolate Azerbaijan in the event of it failing to adopt any measures to lift the blockade. Moscow has not punished Azerbaijan as yet. We have already reached agreement with the Russian Republic and Yeltsin that, given Azerbaijan's resumption of the blockade, Russia will adopt measures in this respect."

Extended Armenia Rationing Details Cited

PM0511142590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Report by correspondents V. Nazaryan, M. Nersesyan from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Store shelves in the republic are emptying literally before our very eyes. Even the most essential goods have disappeared. Coupons for butter, sugar, and coffee—which the Armenians love so much—have been in use for a long time. As from today, by decision of the republic Council of Ministers, coupons are being introduced also for cheese, cereals, and cigarettes. The rations can only evoke a wry smile. The cheese ration, and processed rather than Dutch cheese at that, totals only 300 grams per person per month, cigarettes are restricted

to six packets, while for rice the figure is only 800 grams—and that not per month but per quarter. These quantities, the Ministry of Trade has declared, are dictated by the availability of resources, and these are meager in the republic to put it mildly. It is no accident that the list of rationed foods does not incorporate meat and meat products. These are in short supply even in the markets. Add to this the lack of gasoline and gas shortages—only one-third of the republic requirement for this fuel is being met—and you will get some idea of the kind of winter that is in store for us this year.

Late last night the Armenian legislature finally passed the law on ownership. As from now, the right of ownership in all its forms is recognized and protected by the state. The sooner this new law comes into play, the greater the hope for the stabilization of the economy and life in general. Meanwhile there is food rationing in Armenia.

Armenian Science Academy Freed From Party Control

NC0511141690 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] At the general meeting of the Communist Party of the Armenian Academy of Sciences Presidium, it was decided to terminate the party's operations in the presidium.

The meeting was quite heated and different opinions were expressed. Finally Academician Viktor Ambardzumyan, the president of the Academy of Sciences, told the meeting that the Academy of Sciences must be freed from the control of the party, and furthermore, that party membership should be each member's own concern. The Academy of Sciences must concern itself with the republic's problems and should upgrade the level of science for the future prosperity and advancement of Armenia.

Further Georgian Elections Results Reported

LD0211214290 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 2 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Eduard Ediberidze]

[Text] Tbilisi November 2 TASS—The new Georgian parliament may begin its deliberations, since over two-thirds of its composition—182 deputies out of 250—were elected as a result of the polls held in Georgia last Sunday.

They were held here on a multiparty basis by a mixed majority-proportional system.

The "Roundtable—Free Georgia" bloc collected the greatest number of votes among 11 political parties and blocs participation in the elections. The total of 53.95 percent of the electorate voted for the parties and organizations forming the bloc. It won 81 seats in parliament.

The Georgian Communist Party was a runner-up with 29.57 percent, winning 44 seats. Not a single other party or bloc collected four percent—the minimum vote [percentage] which would have given them the right to send their representatives by party lists to parliament.

As for candidates who were personally nominated for parliament, deputies were elected only in 57 constituencies out of 125. The "Roundtable" carried a landslide majority in this case too, winning 33 seats.

The Communist Party gained 17 seats. Only four independents became deputies. The Georgian People's Front, the Democratic Georgia and Liberation and Economic Revival blocs won one seat each.

Thus, the "Roundtable" has 114 seats in the new parliament and the Communist Party—61.

Run-off elections will be held in 59 constituencies on November 11 where there were more than two candidates but none of them collected more than 50 percent of the vote.

The second round of talks [as received] was scheduled for the same day in seven constituencies where the elections were pronounced invalid. New elections will be held in two months' time in another two constituencies where the elections were not held at all.

Georgian News Agency Changes Name, Status

LD0311224890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] By decision of the Georgian Government, the republican Council of Ministers news agency GRUZINFORM has received a new title and status. In an official report published today, it has been presented as the Georgian national news agency SAKARTVELO—Georgia. It also reported its withdrawal from the single information system of TASS—one of the world's five largest agencies—of which GRUZINFORM was a collective correspondent. From now on, relations between SAKARTVELO and TASS, just as with other agencies in the world, will be on a contractual basis. Almost simultaneously with this step by the Georgian Government, TASS decided to open its own correspondent's office in Tbilisi, as is customary in general journalistic practice throughout the world.

Central Asia

Government Structure Reorganized in Uzbekistan

LD0111155690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1350 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Vladimir Pruger]

[Text] Tashkent, 1 Nov (TASS)—The Council of Ministers of Uzbekistan (Soviet republic in Central Asia) no longer exists as from today. The decision on this was adopted at the republican Supreme Soviet session which

concluded here today. Its functions will be performed by the ministerial cabinet attached to the Uzbekistan president.

The legal basis for this was formed by the law on the improvement of the executive and administrative power structure and the introduction of changes and additions to the republic's constitution. It has been adopted with the aim of creating a harmonious system of state government with the strict separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. Thus, the duplication in the activities of the state organs and the substitution of one organ for another will be removed. In adopting this law, the deputies were aware that under the present conditions of transition to a market economy it is especially important to strengthen the executive power in every possible way, to bring order and discipline to all the sections of the state, economic, social, and cultural structures.

Thus, Uzbek President Islam Karimov is now also chairman of the ministerial cabinet. The president's administration and that of the Council of Ministers are joined in one administration under the president of the republic. The post of vice president of Uzbekistan has been instituted; this person will be appointed by the president and approved by the Supreme Soviet and will take charge of the ministerial cabinet and organize its work at the direction of the president.

The session has ratified the presidential decree on appointing Shukurulla Mirsayidov to the post of vice president, having relieved him of his duties as chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic. The first vice president of Uzbekistan is 51 years old. He is an economist by education and has occupied a number of leading posts in government organs. He has been mayor of Tashkent—the capital of Uzbekistan—for the past three years. He was the head of the Uzbekistan Government since last March. In connection with the adoption of this law the session has introduced the corresponding changes to the draft legislation.

New Kirghiz President Akayev Interviewed

PM0511115190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 90 p 2

[Interview with Kirghiz President Askar Akayev by correspondent K. Bayalinov; place and date not given: "Kirghizia: Open-Door Policy"—first four paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The republic's first president gave his first interview to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on his first working day.

Askar Akayev. Born 1944. Father of four children. He started his working life as a fitter. After graduating from the Leningrad Institute of Precision Mechanics and Optics, he stayed in Leningrad where he defended his candidate's thesis. In 1976 he moved to Frunze. Then he embarked on a career as an engineer, lecturer, and scientist. In 1987 he was elected vice president, and two

years later president, of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences. He is a doctor of technical sciences, a professor, and an academician of the republic Academy of Sciences.

...Complex, dramatic days are over. It seemed that it would not take much for a civil war between north and south to begin. A great deal, including the path Kirghizia would take in the future, depended on who would come to power.

Having lost on all counts, the apparatus took a desperate but ridiculous step: During the swearing-in of Kirghizia's first-ever president, the video cameras were switched off and the republic radio relay was stopped. That was how the conservatives "got their own back" on the people.

[Bayalinov] What is the first step you will take as head of the republic?

[Akayev] Naturally, I will start with consultations since my election to this post came as a complete surprise.

I am a consistent supporter of the market economy, there is no alternative to it, but I think that it is only with the help of the center and other Union republics that we will extricate ourselves from our economic impasse. I recently discovered for myself that 60 percent of all free capital is concentrated in the Asian industrial countries—Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand. We will gear ourselves to them.

[Bayalinov] An "open-door" policy?

[Akayev] Something like that.

[Bayalinov] How would you describe the sociopolitical and economic situation in Kirghizia today?

[Akayev] The situation is not a simple one. The economy is on its last legs. The consequences of the Osh tragedy have not been eliminated, and in addition there is a marked north-south division among the Kirghiz people.

[Bayalinov] In forming the Presidential Council, whom will you opt for: theoreticians or experienced apparatus and economic workers?

[Akayev] Intellectuals and young people who have the gift of political foresight and who have a propensity for analytical work. There will be representatives of all political parties and various nationalities, regions, and social strata of the population in the council.

[Bayalinov] A political hunger strike by dozens of young people of various nationalities is in progress one hundred meters from your temporary office....

[Akayev] I have again met with them and asked the leaders to end the hunger strike since there is a chance of resolving their demands in a normal way. Apas Dzhumagulovich, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and I are very worried by the state of these kids' health. We need them, and not just as representatives of an advanced detachment of young people.... [Akayev ends]

"27 October—Democracy Day" is written on one banner. The tent city is humming like a beehive. At the president's request, the hunger strikers have dropped their demands. All except one—the resignation of A. Masaliyev from the post of chairman of the Kirghiz Supreme Soviet. They intend to ensure the implementation of that demand at any price.

Kirghizia, Belorussia Sign Cooperation Accord

LD0311183190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Frunze, 3 Nov (KIRTAG-TASS)—An agreement on economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Belorussian SSR was signed here today.

The agreement, which will be in force until 1993, was signed by the A. Dzhumagulov and V. Kebich, chairmen of the two republics' Council of Ministers. The agreement aims at developing direct bilateral relations and will facilitate the establishment of closer contacts.

New Turkmen President Niyazov Sworn in 2 Nov

LD0211203190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 2 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An extraordinary fourth session of the Turkmen Supreme Soviet took place in Ashkhabad today. An important event that took place earlier was the reason for convening the session. By universal secret ballot the people of Turkmenia elected their first president on 27 October. Having won 98.3 percent of the votes, Saparmurad Atayevich Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Republican Supreme Soviet, became president. Today, in accordance with Article 116 of the Constitution of the Turkmen SSR, Comrade Niyazov relinquished his powers as chairman of the Supreme Soviet and people's deputy of the republican legislature.

Those who spoke at the session noted that the universal presidential elections held for the first time in the country made it possible for the people to show their attitude to the policy implemented by the republican leadership. This policy is marked by efforts aimed at preserving social stability.

Earlier, at a meeting with the republican aktiv, the elected president said that he would favor the signing of a new union treaty. The republican Council of Ministers relinquished its powers today, too. Deputies proposed their alternative candidates to the posts of chairman of the Supreme Soviet and prime minister of the republic. This was how the swearing-in ceremony was held.

The fourth session will resume its work on 16 November, first in Ashkhabad and, the following day, in the town of Tashauz where issues relating to the ecological situation in the Aral region will be discussed.

Priorities Outlined

PM0211150190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Kuleshov under
"Direct Line" rubric: "Turkmen President Elected"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—As a result of the direct, secret national elections held in Turkmenistan last Saturday Saparmurad Niyazov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, has been elected president of the republic.

The results of the count have not yet been published, but at the republic electoral commission, which confirmed the voting results, it is already known that 98.3 percent of the electorate voted for S. Niyazov. "Yes, an absolute majority cast their vote for him," confirmed Kh. Atayev, deputy chairman of the electoral commission. "Since Niyazov's name is today associated with many good changes in Turkmenia."

After congratulating Saparmurad Atayevich on his election to the new high state office I asked Turkmenia's first president which questions he intends to tackle first.

"In my view, the republic president is not just the head of state, who has to ensure the consolidation of the nation and national and state sovereignty, but, as head of the government also (under the law on the establishment of the presidential form of government in Turkmenistan the apparatus of the republic Council of Ministers as the executive organ is placed under the jurisdiction of the president), must exercise supreme executive power in the republic.

"We are now actively forming links with union republics and foreign partners and moving toward market relations. I believe that in the first stage they should be provided with social guarantees because it is in people's interests to develop the market but at the same time curb its random nature.

"During my campaign meetings with the republic's population I heard the same request almost everywhere: Preserve peace and accord in Turkmenistan, prevent interethnic strife, live according to the laws of brotherhood and friendship, and work for mutually beneficial political, economic, and cultural cooperation with all republics. That is why the first presidential decree will be a law providing the necessary measure of liability for inflaming interethnic hostility, whatever form it takes."